

A Collection of Speeches Picked at Random

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

INDIA and AMERICA

Mahomedali Currim Chagla

Ambassador of India to U. S.

INFORMATION SERVICE OF INDIA, WASHINGTON 8, D. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

•

PART I—LAW AND LIBERTY

RULE OF LAW.....	1
SENTINELS OF LIBERTY.....	9

PART II—INDIA AND THE WORLD

MEANS AND ENDS.....	17
BASTION OF DEMOCRACY.....	27

PART III—PROGRESS IN FREEDOM

WAR AGAINST WANT.....	37
PLANNING FOR PROSPERITY.....	45

PART IV—ISSUES OF CONSCIENCE

POPULATION EXPLOSION.....	55
PLANNED PARENTHOOD.....	61

PART V—OUR TWO DEMOCRACIES

INDIA AND AMERICA.....	69
SOVEREIGN PEOPLE.....	77
COMMON BONDS.....	87



INTRODUCTION

This book contains some of the speeches I delivered during my stay of two and a half years here as Ambassador of my country. The book is being published on the eve of my departure and it gives me great pleasure to note how warm and cordial the relations between our two countries are—an all-time high.

When I came here Indian policy was still suspect and there was a great deal of misunderstanding about our attitude and what we stood for. Neutralism was a word of bad odour. Today it has become respectable and American policy is beginning to realise the importance and value of neutralism in this world of tensions and conflicts. Our socialistic approach was also looked at askant. The importance of the public sector in India and our pragmatic socialism is now accepted as the only realistic policy in a poor and under-developed country. But the greatest realisation that has come in this country is the vital importance of economic development in India in a democratic setting. The future will be bright indeed if our two democracies can march hand in hand to bring about better international understanding and cooperation throughout the world.

Ambassador of India

Washington D C
June 1 1961

PART I

Law and Liberty

RULE OF LAW

THE RULE OF LAW is the very basis or foundation of democracy. Democracy cannot function unless the Law is supreme. The Rule of Law connotes equal protection, to all persons, of law. Law must be completely indifferent to the caste, community, religion, race or colour of the person with whom it is dealing. There must also be a provision for a fair trial of a person accused of any offense and a prohibition against the deprivation of a person's freedom without due process of law. To you and to us who both enjoy a democratic constitution, these are almost elementary and axiomatic principles. But in the United States and in India, the supremacy of law goes even beyond what it is in the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, Parliament is supreme and sovereign. Theoretically, it has the right to enact any law which cannot be challenged. The Judges must give effect to such a law, their power being restricted merely to interpret it. In our countries, it is the Constitution that is supreme and sovereign and a very important consequence flows from this fact. The Congress here and Parliament in India have to function within the four corners of the Constitution. They cannot infringe against any of its provisions. Therefore, if the fundamental rights of its citizens or, as you call it, the Bill of Rights is written into the Constitution, then the fundamental rights or the Bill of Rights becomes the supreme law of the land and the Congress or the Parliament cannot, in any way, alter or amend it. A further consequence is that in both our countries the Judges are armed with the power of judicial review which confers upon them the important power

*American Society of International Law
Washington D C
Address delivered on April 30, 1960*

of declaring any law or any act of Government to be invalid which in any way violates any article of the Constitution

In recent times, there has been more and more a tendency to emphasise on what the content of the law should be when one speaks of the Rule of Law. It is beginning to be realised that even though you may have the supremacy of law in a country, the law itself may be such as to deprive the individual of his important rights. Parliament itself may pass a law setting up a totalitarian State or may arm the Government with power to rule by decrees or to imprison people without trial. Therefore, it seems to be meaningless to speak of the Rule of Law and emphasise merely the supremacy of law without considering what the provisions of the law should be. It is, therefore, suggested by political thinkers who are interested in the maintenance of democratic institutions that the law in every country should have certain minimum characteristics. It must primarily uphold the liberty of the individual and the dignity of man. For, after all law is enacted for the individual, for his betterment, and for his advance, to help him in his pursuit of happiness. Every law, therefore, should guarantee to the individual not only his freedom which should not be taken away from him without a fair trial, without giving him the right of defending himself, without his being confronted with the evidence on which the decision is to be based but also the law should provide for every citizen to have the right to occupy any office without discrimination based on colour, race or religion and to the extent the economy of his country may permit, right to work, right to minimum wage and the bare minimum for civilised living. It should also contain what are indeed the essentials of a democratic life—right to practise any religion, right of association and right to freedom of expression. I, therefore, beg of you not to be misled when you are told about a country that has parliamentary institutions and that the people are governed by law. You must ask further and enquire what the nature of the law is, because in certain parts of the world we are witnessing the distortion and perversion of law when law permits people being driven from their homes, being segregated

and being put in ghettos and being refused the right to work as they choose and when they are even denied free communication in their own country.

That there should be a Rule of Law in our national policy is almost taken for granted by all civilised communities. But let us not forget that the idea of Rule of Law is a recent growth. There were times not very distant when people settled their own quarrels by methods which they themselves thought proper and adequate. We had duelling by which people met any insult to their honour. We had a system of vendettas by which people resolved their more serious disputes. Then it was gradually realised that punishment was for the State and not for any individual and if the individual had a grievance, he should go to the Court of Law and the Judge would do justice and give to everyone what was his due. It would seem fantastic today to suggest that if two persons had a quarrel, they should fight it out and justice would lie with the victorious party and yet, strange as it may seem, we have not yet recognised the necessity and importance of Rule of Law in international affairs. All down the ages, man has striven for peace. History is often a ghastly tale of wars with short interludes of truce and preparations for the next contest. But history also records how humanity has aspired for a cessation of conflict between nations and for goodwill and understanding between them.

It is usual to speak of nature as being red in tooth and claw. But the animal world is not violent out of greed and lust for power. Its violence is actuated by hunger and satisfaction of natural needs. Once they are satisfied, neither the tooth nor the claw remains red. But man's violence is more calculated and more malevolent. It can be brutal and barbarous and can be aimed at not merely the destruction of the body but also of the mind and even the soul. To bring about peace among men, we need a basic change of individual and national character. We need a complete change of approach to disputes that arise between States. We need the growth in our people of the democratic instinct that every problem is capable of solution by discussion and debate.

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

In a darkening situation, with nuclear bombs ready to be hurled at a moment's notice and the very existence of civilisation in deadly peril, the United Nations Organization and the International Court of Justice stand out as beacons of light. They constitute the despairing hope of mankind that some day man will give up the ways of violence and settle his disputes in a civilised manner. The United Nations Organization was intended for settling the political disputes between States. The International Court was set up to settle legal disputes between States.

If someone owed me a debt or if someone assaulted me, I would not take the law in my own hands and realise the debt with brute force or pay back the assault in kind, but I would go to a Court of Law and get a decree for the debt and let the Court execute it or get the wrongdoer punished by a criminal court. In the domestic and national field, this is a simple and elementary idea. It is an idea which has been in force in all civilised countries for centuries. And yet it has taken ages before even the possibility of such an idea being applicable in the international field has been recognised.

The International Court of Justice owes its origin to the permanent Court of Arbitration set up in 1899. This was not a court in the strict sense of the term. It was only a machinery for providing *ad hoc* arbitration. A panel of arbitrators was maintained by each country nominating four persons and out of this panel the countries that wanted to go to arbitration could select one or more arbitrators. In 1920, the Permanent Court of Justice was set up under the Covenant of the League of Nations and in 1945 was established the present Court of International Justice. The jurisdiction of the Permanent Court and the International Court is for all *practical purposes identical*.

The most salient feature of the jurisdiction of the International Court is that it is voluntary. In the language of International Law, jurisdiction represents the will of the State. As the States who submit to the jurisdiction of the Court are sovereign States, the Court can only acquire jurisdiction when the State so wills it. No State can be compelled

against its will to submit to the jurisdiction of the Court. It is in keeping with this fundamental conception that the system of optional clause has been evolved. Under this system any State can make a declaration stating with regard to what subjects it accepts the jurisdiction of the Court. Then with regard to those subjects, the jurisdiction becomes compulsory. Then there is a further safeguard. If a dispute arises between two States, then the jurisdiction of the Court will be confined to those subjects with regard to which there is a complete identity between the declarations of the two States. If a State has submitted to the jurisdiction of the Court by its declaration with regard to subjects A, B and C and the other State has only submitted to the jurisdiction of the Court with regard to subjects B and C, then the jurisdiction of the Court between the two States is confined to subjects B and C.

It may be said that in the present state of international relations, the jurisdiction of the Court must inevitably be voluntary and optional. At the same time, this constitutes the greatest weakness of the Court. If it were left to a debtor or a law-breaker to decide whether he should submit to the jurisdiction of the national Courts, very few debts would be paid and law would rarely be enforced. And yet what seems so obvious to us in our domestic and national affairs is looked upon as startling and unacceptable in the international domain.

When the statutes of the Court were being drafted, there was a section of opinion which strongly pressed for the jurisdiction of the International Court being compulsory with regard to certain specified matters but unfortunately for the world, this section was overruled. It is a hopeful sign for the future that a large number of countries have filed declarations accepting the jurisdiction of the Court with regard to certain matters. This country has done the same but unfortunately it has qualified its declaration by incorporating into it what is known as the Connolly Amendment. The Senate here accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court after this amendment has been passed. The effect of this amend-

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

ment is that the United States has adopted a formula by which it excludes from the competence of the Court any matter which in its opinion falls within its domestic jurisdiction. The result has been practically to place the Court at the mercy of the United States because it deprives the Court of its jurisdiction merely by claiming that any matter brought before the Court is in its judgment within its domestic jurisdiction. In effect, this confers upon the United States Government a veto upon the jurisdiction of the Court. It would be bad enough if the United States could resort to this provision if it was brought before the Court by any other country. But the United States is hoist by its own petard because when she goes to the Court to sue any other country, under the rule of reciprocity to which I have referred, every country is entitled to avail itself of the same right to veto the jurisdiction of the Court. The result has been that the United States is prevented from getting the Court to adjudicate upon any of its claims.

You will forgive my saying so but I cannot understand how the United States can justify a piece of legislation which reduces the Court to a mockery and which effectively prevents any rule of law ever being established in the international field. You must not forget that the United States proudly claims to be the leader of the free world. She wants peace but peace with justice and how can you ever have justice if the only forum which can settle international disputes is reduced to a humiliating position where it cannot entertain any disputes which ought to be properly decided by it. The effort of the United States far from reducing the jurisdiction of the Court should be to work for a strong and powerful Court which will have more and more compulsory jurisdiction between countries. It is only when the world realises that the only way to peace is not to think of resorting to arms when there is a conflict between countries but to get these conflicts resolved according to the principles of International Law, there will be reduction in international tensions and a genuine hope for peace.

There is a growing feeling in this country that the Connolly Amendment should be repealed. President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon and the American Bar Association have made an eloquent appeal for it and I certainly hope that this Association will lend its weight to restoring dignity and power to the International Court. The repeal of the Connolly Amendment should only be the first step towards the evolution of rule of law in international affairs.

There are three reasons why private disputes between citizens in any country can be peacefully settled. First is the supremacy of the law. The second is the existence of the Courts of Law to whose jurisdiction every citizen has compulsorily to submit. The third is that there is sanction behind the decision of the Court. In the case of the International Court none of these three conditions is present. There is no International Law which is supreme and sovereign. International Law is still being evolved but it is neither definite nor precise nor have sovereign States agreed to be bound by International Law as declared by the International Court. With regard to the jurisdiction of the Court, I have already pointed out that it is not compulsory but optional. With regard to the third condition, if a country against whom the judgment of the International Court is given refuses to carry it out, there is nothing that the Court can do. The only provision in the Statute is that the aggrieved party can apply to the Security Council and the Security Council can decide what measures should be taken to give effect to the Judgment. There are certain other facts in the working of the International Court to which I might draw your attention. I have just come back from that Court after acting as an *Ad Hoc Judge*. There was a dispute before that Court between India and Portugal, and as India has no permanent representation on the Bench, she had the right to nominate a representative on the Bench. I think the system of *Ad Hoc Judges* is bad. There are fifteen permanent Judges of the International Court who are reputed to be the finest jurists in the world. The countries should learn to have confidence in these Judges. What would one think of a defendant who wants to nominate

a representative on the Court which is trying a case against him?

In my opinion, it is inherently wrong for Judges of the highest tribunal to be elected but I see no other way of constituting a Court. At least we can do this. The tenure of a Judge is 9 years and he is elected by a majority of the members of the Security Council and the United Nations General Assembly. We can increase his tenure and debar a Judge from being re-elected. It is not right that a sitting Judge of the International Court should be dependent for his continuance upon political considerations that prevail both in the Security Council and in the United Nations General Assembly.

I think it is also necessary to sound a note of warning that even though Judges of the International Court are elected, they should not be elected for political considerations. They should only be elected for their qualifications as lawyers and jurists. The Statute of the Court requires that in electing Judges, the Assembly and the Security Council should be satisfied that the persons elected possess the qualifications required in their respective countries for appointment to the highest judicial office. I think more than that is necessary, they should not merely possess the qualifications but they should have actually held high judicial offices, and if you want jurists, they should have taught International Law at Universities or written books on International Law. If perchance the Court were to be manned by politicians, then any hope of the Court becoming the adjudicator of disputes between countries will disappear.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope that the American Society of International Law will play an important role in the evolution of the Rule of Law in international affairs.

SENTINELS OF LIBERTY

THE LAWYER has always played an important and distinguished role in his own country. He has been in the vanguard of the fight for liberty. He has also been a staunch champion of the rule of law. The rule of law can only function in a free atmosphere and liberty has to be controlled and disciplined by law.

In my own country Gandhi, the father of the nation, was a lawyer. Our Prime Minister Nehru is also a lawyer. May I remind you that at the Philadelphia Convention where your Constitution was drafted, 34 out of 55 delegates were lawyers? The study of law is not merely the gaining of knowledge about the laws of one's country. It is a liberal education, a discipline of the mind. Law teaches us precision, lucidity of expression, the value of words, and more than anything else, how to sift the wheat from the chaff, how to discard the irrelevancies that surround a subject and how to get at the root of the matter. It is because of this that a trained lawyer will make a success of any department with which he is entrusted. It is not our professional pride that makes me say so—the mettle of the lawyer has been tested and proved in a thousand positions of responsibility of national and international importance. I think it was Bacon who said that the progressive character of a country is to be determined by the status that is given to the judges in that country. I would go further and say that free and democratic institutions cannot survive unless the lawyer is respected in the community.

Annual dinner of Law Alumni Association of New York University

Address delivered on April 12, 1961

and the community expects from him his contribution to its welfare

Turning first to the domestic role of the lawyer, it is not enough that he should be merely an advocate for his client. It is true that even in this role he plays an important part in the administration of justice. Our system of justice requires a fair trial and not an inquisition. And a fair trial presupposes the judge being presented with two sides of the issue before him. Truth is always difficult to ascertain, but there are more chances of justice not going astray if the lawyer vigorously and even passionately pleads the cause of his client against his opponent. This does not make the lawyer a partisan—rather he helps the court to discover the truth by putting his point of view against the opposite presentation.

But the lawyer must be interested in the rule of law. The meaning of this expression has had considerable extension in modern times. At one time it meant the supremacy of law and the equality of every person before the law. But as society developed it was realised that this was too narrow an interpretation of that expression. It has now come to be accepted that rule of law can only be effective in a country provided the conditions are such that the dignity of the human personality and the liberty of the individual are respected. Law cannot function in a vacuum. If sections of society are deprived of the benefits of law and are treated as second class citizens or if the law does not protect the liberty of the individual, then it would be meaningless to say that the rule of law prevails. In other words, the tendency now is not merely to look at the procedural aspects of law but to examine its content. What is the law which a country has put on the statute book? It is not enough that a country should have the trappings of democracy—an elected Parliament and a responsible executive. Even an elected Parliament can be guilty of gross violations of the rights of citizens. And the violations are all the more dangerous because they seem to have the consent of the people, the consent being democratically obtained. At least a dictatorship or a totalitarian regime would be more open to challenge in that the tyrannical

laws it passes were passed without popular approval. Therefore, it is essential that the lawyer should always be vigilant and try and prevent Congress or Parliament from making inroads into the fundamental rights of citizens. In times of danger, all the greater vigilance is called for. Because at such times passions are aroused and in the holy name of public security civil rights may be whittled away. It is good to remember what Justice Holmes said that it must be present and clear danger which can at all justify the violation of your Bill of Rights and the Fundamental Rights of our Constitution. The threat to freedom which the present day world holds out cannot be met by our sacrificing our freedom but rather by strengthening and safeguarding our heritage of liberty.

There is also another important task which the lawyer has to undertake. This is to safeguard individual liberty against the encroachments of the State. In the last 100 years there has been a dramatic change in the role of the State and its relations towards the individual. We have moved very far indeed from the philosophy which believed in *laissez faire* and which called upon the State to govern as little as possible and permitted it only to enforce law and order. Competition and the laws of the market were the dominant features of society in its economic aspect. Life has become so complicated, technology has advanced so far and ideas of a Welfare State have made such progress that a more positive role for the State is taken for granted. The individual has to be protected against concentration of economic power, his social security has to be safeguarded and many activities have to be undertaken which only a Government armed with large powers could successfully carry out. Even in this country of free enterprise partly because free enterprise functions here in a massive way, it is apt to be forgotten that the presence of Government is all pervasive in the economy of the country and impinges upon the freedom of the individual at many points. The tendency everywhere is for the State to become more and more powerful and almost assume the proportions of a monolith. I need hardly tell you that the most important

feature of a democratic society is that it is pluralistic—power is divided and not concentrated. While on the one hand we must be prepared to arm our respective governments with more power which should be used in the interests of the citizens, to add to their welfare, to come to the rescue of the weak and unemployed and disabled, we have always to bear in mind the fact that a line must be drawn between the power of the State and the rights of the individual. The line very often is difficult to draw. It is sometimes indistinct and sometimes it is blurred over. But the duty of the lawyer is to guard this line as he would the last bastion of democracy. It is not enough that the lawyer should fight in the courts for the rights of the individual which are safeguarded by the Constitution. He has to protect the individual against the overpowering onslaught of various tendencies in modern society which leads to a dull and drab uniformity which crushes out of the individual all his individuality and which turns him adrift at the mercy of all the forces which tend to turn him into a mere peg for the greater glory of the organisation or the State.

No one should understand or appreciate the plight of the individual and the necessity for rescuing him from the almost irresistible tide of conformity and mass doctrination better than the lawyer. Our law is based on individual rights. Our jurisprudence recognises the fact that the individual is the pivot of society and all legislation must conform to the development of the individual and the maintenance of his dignity. It is necessary therefore that the lawyer should take the lead in resisting and withstanding many influences which seek to convert man into a robot with either an empty mind or a mind completely brainwashed by propaganda relayed through our powerful media of mass communication. In this scientific, technological and electronic age, the supremacy of the individual requires to be asserted.

On the domestic front, I should also like to refer to the controversial question of civil rights, which in my opinion should not be controversial at all as far as lawyers are concerned. To every American lawyer the principle of the American Con-

stitution, the ringing words of the Declaration of Independence, the noble sentiments uttered by Jefferson and Lincoln should be part of his legal heritage and an important element of his creed. The question of civil rights is not so much a question of race relations. It is a question of human dignity and the value of the individual irrespective of colour, community or race. Today the tide of human equality is coming in very strongly and only the Canutes in South Africa could think of stopping this tide. My great anxiety is to see that that image of America is not tarnished in the world outside. One or two recent events in the United Nations have rung a bell the peals of which have been heard in different countries with great joy and the people of those countries are again looking to this country to take a lead which it did when it issued the Declaration of Independence and enacted the Constitution. We lawyers should not merely defend the rights of our clients. It is our paramount duty to defend the rights of our fellow citizens which rights have been guaranteed by the Constitution.

But there is an equally important and responsible task waiting to be performed by lawyers on the international front. When we deal with our domestic affairs, we take it for granted that we do not settle our quarrels or our disputes by force nor do we now fight duels to resolve questions affecting our honour. We have established Courts and provided for the supremacy of law and tried to make everyone equal before the law. But in the long and chequered history of man's evolution this was not easy to achieve.

We have now to take one further step in this onward march of humanity. We have to achieve peace and abolish war as a method of solving international problems. It is not enough to talk of controls of arms or even of disarmament. We must remove the very thought of war from our minds and hearts. We have to bring about world peace through law. In other words, we have to establish an international rule of law. Law must be made supreme in international affairs. Arbitration of war should be made as archaic or outdated as duelling has become in our own national affairs.

We have, therefore, to think in terms of a world community. War and peace have now become indivisible, so has prosperity and poverty. We have to establish a law for this world community. Poets and philosophers have dreamt of a world parliament of men. The dream can be realised through the United Nations, though we often do not realise the significance of that body. We have the International Court which can enforce the international Rule of Law. The Court is still weak, handicapped by its jurisdiction being circumscribed and lacking the power to carry out its orders and decrees. It is for lawyers here to give a lead to strengthen the Court and to repose confidence in the integrity and independence of the eminent jurists who sit on its Bench. Reservations like the Connolly reservation only postpone the day for which we should all be working.

The Court itself is evolving principles of international law and there is a Commission sitting in Geneva which is trying to codify the principles of that law. The task is not easy, but if we are ever going to pass from the stage of international barbarism to the stage of world peace through law, then it is the duty of every lawyer to make his individual contribution toward that consummation. It is a human tragedy that in an age which has made such rapid strides in scientific and technological knowledge we should so woefully lag behind in the science of human relations.

Finally in this world of tensions and conflicts, when nations are all the time on a war footing, and when war, although it may be a cold war, is actually being waged in many parts of the world, the only objective standard we can hold on to is law. It is dispassionate, it is no respecter of persons or races, it is not concerned with ideologies. Its sway is serene and majestic and all of us who have served law in one capacity or another will always be proud to have been the servants of so beneficent a master.

PART II

India and the World

MEANS
AND
ENDS

THIS IS A GREAT PRIVILEGE to address this Convocation Just before I came here, I delivered the Convocation address of the Poona University Our convocation addresses are different, they are delivered to students who have graduated and who are leaving the university and are stepping out into the world We wish them well, give them a little advice and figuratively wave to them as they start upon their different careers

Your convocation is different—it is a gathering of students and members of faculties come together to do me the honor of hearing to what I have to say and so I think my responsibility is greater I must make you feel that your time has not been wholly wasted and that I have at least placed before you some thoughts and ideas which deserve attention and which may lead up to your ultimately forming definite conclusions on some of the vital issues facing us today

We are living in a very exciting age—it is an age of science and discovery and great material progress Man has never felt as he does today that he is the lord of the creation Having conquered land and sea, he is out to conquer the air and outer space He is in possession of tremendous power with infinite potentiality for good or evil He can use this power so as to wipe out poverty and suffering from this world, to bring beauty and grace into the lives of men, to open up new vistas of knowledge so that man should be nobler and wiser Or, he can use this very power to destroy and devastate and even to annihilate this world and all creation on it Your generation

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

will play a big part in moulding and shaping this age. Is it going to be an age of peace, plenty and prosperity or is it going to be an age of tensions, conflicts and possibly war and all the terrible ravages that war brings in its train? We in India think that the moral and spiritual stature of man has not kept pace with his material advancement—and that explains most of the emotional conflicts we suffer from today.

India believes that spiritual values must and ought to play an important part in life—that we must from time to time hold out our hands to the stars and get away from the possessions and passions that hold us down to the world and which emphasise the material side of life. It is, therefore, we look askance at scientists who only think of science and not its human implications. There is too much specialization in our education. We have started to think in compartments. A scientist feels that he is not interested in what the consequences of his research or investigation might be. I think the old idea that a liberal education, a study of humanities was a sound basis for the ultimate proficiency in any subject was a good one and it is a pity in our hurry to get on we are gradually discarding those notions and conceptions which gave to life grace and charm and illumined our short existence here with a dignity which defined the slings and arrows of a fortune however adverse and however outrageous.

It is this belief in spiritual value which makes us attach as much importance to means as to ends. Gandhi, the father of our nation, in the midst of our very struggle for freedom, never ceased to emphasise that we win our freedom with clean hands, that we must not soil them with blood. To him the quality of our achievement was more important than the fact of achievement and it is because of this that we fought England with non-violent means. It is because of this that by temperament, by our philosophy we are wedded to peace. Peace is not with us a matter of policy or expediency. We do not think that peace will be more profitable to us than war. Peace is a part of our faith—part of our tradition and heritage.

This is really the basis of our belief in co existence. We

sincerely believe that friendship, understanding, tolerance can bring about peace in this troubled world. It is not necessary that you agree with or approve a point of view in order that you should understand it or tolerate it. No one has the monopoly of wisdom. Even evil may have something to teach us. It is wrong to assume that something is either black or white. There are many intermediate colours and white and black may get inextricably interwoven. We do not become Communist because we are on friendly terms with Russia and China. We do not subscribe to their ideology because we try to understand that ideology and tolerate it. Co-existence implies the right of every country to determine its own fate and complete independence in its own internal and domestic policy.

It is a grave error to accuse India of neutralism. Neutralism means knowing the difference between right and wrong and refusing to side with either. It is an obnoxious expression which can only be true of cowardly people without a backbone. We know what is right and are emphatically on the side of right. Today, many nations besides ourselves have agreed upon the same policy of co-existence—they are the uncommitted nations—not uncommitted to right or wrong but uncommitted to the cold war, to tension and conflict and unceasing diplomatic warfare. It is our profound belief that these uncommitted countries have created a climate of peace—small maybe—but a climate which will gradually extend till it covers the whole world and all countries till we have peace and goodwill reigning on this earth to which we will all be passionately and loyally committed.

It is also because of this that we do not believe in military pacts and military bases. We may girdle the whole world with these bases and surround the whole Communist world and we may still be as far away from peace as ever. If history teaches us one lesson it is this that no idea can be crushed or destroyed by military might. The mighty Roman Empire tried to destroy Christianity as an insidious doctrine that tried to preach the equality of man and undermine the Empire. The more the persecution the more Christianity spread. If Communism has any intrinsic value as a philosophy of life it

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

will spread and will jump over any military barrier. If we think it evil, then the true way to fight it is by pitting our own democratic faith against the Communist creed. We are very often men of little faith and we do not show the same devotion and dedication to our democratic faith that a Communist does to his. We must, therefore, strengthen our faith, we must prove to people in Asia and Africa that democracy can produce results and that democracy alone can uphold the dignity of man and the liberty of the individual.

We are trying to do that in India. We have a democratic Constitution. But mere adult suffrage and election of a Parliament and putting a Government responsible to Parliament in power is not the essence of democracy. We must realize that democracy is the cult of the individual and not of the State. It is only to the extent that the stature of the individual is heightened and his dignity is enhanced that the purpose of democracy is served. Our Constitution provides all the safeguards which the individual in modern times so desperately needs against an all-powerful State. We have assured to the individual the freedom of person, thought, association and religion. In our country the press is free, there is no censorship. Opinion is free—any party can flourish in India, any idea can be expressed, any association can be formed so long as it is not subversive or intended to overthrow constituted authority by violence or unconstitutional means. We have recognised every citizen in India as equal irrespective of caste or community. We have no first-class and second class citizenship. However shamefully we may have behaved in the past in treating a section of our fellow citizens as untouchables, today we treat them as full fledged citizens entitled to all the rights and privileges which any other citizen is entitled to. We have no discrimination, no segregation, no ghettos in our country.

We have no state religions. Ours is a secular State. We respect all religions and permit every one to worship God in his own way. We believe that religion is an individual matter between man and his Creator and the State has no concern with it.

But all these rights of the individual would only be on paper and worthless unless there was some machinery to enforce them. And we have provided the finest machinery that any civilised country can boast of—an independent Judiciary which has been constituted the custodian of the rights of citizens and which is armed with the power of Judicial review—the power to decide upon the constitutionality of any law or any executive act—the same power that the Supreme Court here possesses.

But we have still to satisfy our people that democracy can produce results. And that is the most difficult task we are presently engaged upon. Our country is poor and illiterate. Our land does not produce one fifth of the food it should produce for our people because we are still tilling the land according to ancient methods and have failed to introduce modern mechanical methods, the tractors, the chemical fertilizers, etc. It is not the fault of our farmers. In the first place, he has not the means. In the second place, he is wholly dependent upon nature. If the rains fail, his crop grown with hard, untiring labour is destroyed. And so not only we have to provide the modern implements of agriculture but also dams which would store water which the farmer can use when nature is inclement. We have recently laid down our land and agricultural policy. The tiller of the soil, the occupant of the land was merely a serf—the landlord got all the fat of the land without working for it. We have made the tiller the owner. We have fixed a ceiling on the land he can possess, so that he should not have more than what he can himself cultivate. We have, therefore, decided to have a society of peasant proprietors. But that has brought us up against a very serious problem. The small peasant proprietor cannot afford to have a tractor or use chemical fertilizers. It is vital for us to increase our food production. What are we to do? Should we coerce and drill our farmers into communes or collectives so that they could jointly cultivate land and if the State were to take over the ownership of the land, it could provide all the modern implements and instruments which science has devised for the improvement of agriculture? We

have set our face against this tempting short-cut to our difficulties and problems. We have decided to have service co-operatives. A farmer may voluntarily join this co-operative and get from it all the necessary implements and fertilizers. But, mark you, this is absolutely voluntary. There is no compulsion on the farmer to join these co-operatives.

But merely increasing our food production—however important—will not solve our problem of poverty. We must industrialise our country in order to produce enough wealth to raise the standard of life of our people. So far, our economy was colonial—we exported raw materials which were returned to us manufactured. There was no heavy industry in our country. We had to import steel, machinery, most of manufactured articles. The result was appalling poverty and unemployment. We have now launched our Second Five-Year Plan (having successfully completed our First Five-Year Plan) and are preparing a Third Five Year Plan to industrialize our country. We want to produce all the steel we need, we want to make the tools which make the machinery which will ultimately make all that we need—automobiles, aeroplanes, industrial plants, etc. For all this, we need capital. Capital is the result of the savings of the people which is invested. But it is ironical to speak of saving when the majority of people are living on the verge of starvation. We are, therefore, desperately in need of capital to push through our two Plans and lead our country to prosperity. It is here that we believe that the United States can play a big role. America can cooperate with us economically in maintaining our democratic institutions while we are producing the necessary economic results. If we cannot produce these results and produce them soon, democracy will fail in India. Our people will lose faith in the democratic processes. They will turn to some other political doctrine which will give them food and shelter and employment. Therefore, the co-operation between India and the United States in the ultimate analysis will not be merely economic but will also be political in the most vital sense of that expression—a close collaboration with India in the cause of democracy. If America be-

believes in democracy in Asia then she cannot allow democracy to fail in the largest and most populous democratic country in the East. When America was building up her own economic and industrial society in her early days, she herself was helped by European powers with long-term loans. It is now for America to invest in Indian democracy, it is for her to have faith in the ultimate solution of India's economic problems and the emergence of a prosperous India through democratic processes.

India stands for a socialistic pattern of society. We mean by this that we want to do social and economic justice to our people. If that justice requires that in order to increase the wealth of our country and remove poverty Government should undertake to start industries in the public sector, Government will do so. If the private sector in any particular instance behaves unpatriotically or against the public interest, the private sector will be made to submit to the control of Government and if necessary even to have that particular industry removed from the private sector and transferred to the public sector. Each section in our country must serve the social good. That does not mean that there is no room for private or as you call it "free enterprise" in our country. Not only there is room but there is ample and expanding room. There are large areas in our industrial growth which we have left open for private enterprise. In this area, we welcome the participation of American capital. It is a complete travesty of facts to call our socialistic pattern a form of Communism. There is no element of compulsion in our socialism. What we are doing is for the public good with the consent and willing cooperation of our people. The Government here spends billions of dollars to render social services to her people. America without perhaps realising it is accepting more and more the socialist pattern of society which is our aim and our ideal.

India also stands for nationalism. It was her nationalism that has enabled her to throw off the colonial yoke and achieve her freedom. Therefore, she is naturally sympathetic to all

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

colonial countries trying to follow in her footsteps and also to all nationalist forces fighting reactionary Governments

Our recognition of China emanates from the same principle. To us, China, however much we may differ from her ideology, represents the triumph of nationalism and the elimination of foreign influence. Whatever else China is, she is nationalist China and the people of China owe allegiance to her Government. We also believe that there should be realism in politics. A fact does not cease to exist because we choose to ignore it. And China is a patent unmistakable fact. We feel that by putting China outside the pale of United Nations, we are only weakening that body and making it unrepresentative. How can a body be described the United Nations when a nation of 600 millions has no place in it? Even assuming that China's policies are warlike and not conducive to peace, she will be more amenable to reason by being submitted to the jurisdiction of the United Nations and subjected to the censure that that body might pass than if she was free to do what she liked.

Our attitude is the same towards the Middle East. We recognise Arab nationalism and in our opinion it is a powerful force which must ultimately prevail. It is a mistake not to recognise this force and come to terms with it. It is equally wrong to equate this force with Communism. By following a wrong policy we may ultimately drive it in the arms of Communism. Nor do we think that we should support the status quo when the status quo represents reactionary forces and nationalism progressive ones. The modern history of the world represents the triumph of revolutionary nationalism. This very country is a classic example of the triumph of that doctrine. We also salute the emerging personality of Africa from centuries of oppression and darkness. It is in our hands to make the movement an evolutionary one and not drive the people of Africa to establish their independence through blood, sweat and tears. Africa has become resurgent and is on the march—it is the act of statesmanship to guide and help her on her onward march and not to obstruct her progress and thwart her legitimate aspirations.

This what India stands for—freedom, democracy and na-

onalism. She stands for the same principles which are part of the true American tradition. Friendship between America and India is friendship between two great democracies of East and West. Our friendship with other countries can never come in the way of this friendship. Economic cooperation between our two countries in the next few years may constitute a turning point in the history of the world. It is sure result in the victory of the cause of freedom and democracy in a large and important part of Asia.

BASTION OF DEMOCRACY

INDIA HAS JUST COMPLETED 10 years as a Republic functioning under a democratic Constitution. Has India played her role in isolation or has she played a part in the comity of nations? Her size and her population must inevitably make an imprint upon world affairs, but I hope to satisfy you that that imprint is not the result of mere size or numbers but is due to a vigorous and dynamic policy she has pursued.

In the first place, she has definitely strengthened the free world. India is a bastion of democracy holding aloft the flag of the freedom of the individual, the dignity of man and the Rule of Law. Among all the Asian and African nations that have recently achieved freedom, she has been steadfast in her loyalty to the cause of democracy. She has not limited or qualified the democratic principle, nor has she sought the short cut in order to solve her many problems and overcome many of her difficulties.

I think the most important contribution she has made to international polity is the doctrine of non-alignment, peaceful co-existence and the non-violent approach to world problems. The Indian revolution which gave freedom to India was unique in history. It was undoubtedly a tale of sacrifice and suffering, of sweat and tears, but no blood tainted the glorious annals when Mahatma Gandhi led an unarmed and non-violent army against the mightiest Empire the world has seen. That Empire abdicated because the determination of

here and elsewhere. But we will not permit foreign armies to fight from our soil or to make our country the base for attacking another country. We have bitter experience from history of how freedom and independence can be jeopardised if you once allow foreign influence to dictate your policy or your defence.

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

the people was more powerful than guns or bombs could ever have been, and strangely enough that struggle, arduous as it was, left no bitterness, and today India is still a member of the British Commonwealth. There are more Englishmen in India now than there were before Independence and the volume of trade between England and India is larger than it ever was. This is the greatest triumph of Gandhi's doctrine of non-violence.

And this doctrine has been the corner stone of our foreign policy; again and again we have applied it to the situations that have arisen since we became free and have refused to be swerved from the path we have chalked out by any temporary failure.

In the teeth of a great deal of misunderstanding and even hostility in this country, we have adhered to our policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. We have refused to enter into any military alliance or sign any defence pacts with any country. We have regretted the existence of the cold war, but have refused to take sides or increase the climate of tension; on the other hand, we have tried to restrict its area by persuading other countries also to remain unaligned. Many countries in Asia and Africa and even in Europe and South America have now acclaimed our policy and adopted it. Our recent difficulties with China have further underlined the soundness of our policy. It is precisely because we did not belong to either of the powerful groups that we have succeeded in localising the dispute between ourselves and our mighty neighbour. Even the threat to our frontier has not induced us to succumb to the temptation of entering into defence pacts or military alliances with powerful countries. We still believe, as we believed in those far off days, when we were struggling for freedom, that the greatest strength of a country is the determination of its people. We believe that if we have to fight China—and fight we will if the sanctity of our country is violated and every inch of our country is sacred—we will fight her with all that we possess—our large population, our army, our air force, our arms and armament. If this is not enough, we will buy more from

here and elsewhere. But we will not permit foreign armies to fight from our soil or to make our country the base for attacking another country. We have bitter experience from history of how freedom and independence can be jeopardised if you once allow foreign influence to dictate your policy or your defence.

And even while we are preparing ourself against any further aggression from China, we have not given up our belief in the peaceful approach. We are prepared to negotiate with China—the Conference Room is always kept open and we are always prepared to sit down at the same table with our worst enemies.

We were confronted with a similar problem in Kashmir and Goa. Although Kashmir constitutionally and in accordance with international law joined the Indian Union, Pakistan committed aggression against and even today is unlawfully in occupation of a part of Kashmir. At the beginning of this aggression, we could have driven out the soldiers of Pakistan, but it might have led to a conflagration and a war between us and our neighbour. We forbore from doing this and approached the Security Council complaining of Pakistan's aggression. That aggression still continues and the resolution of the Security Council calling upon Pakistan to vacate the aggression has not been given effect to. When some people glibly talk of our equivocal policy with regard to Kashmir, they should remember these salient and undisputed facts. But we are always prepared to discuss the question of Kashmir with Pakistan—but the discussion must be on the basis of our legal sovereignty over Kashmir being recognised

Pakistan—exactly as we want China to recognise certain

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

the people was more powerful than guns or bombs could ever have been, and strangely enough that struggle, arduous as it was, left no bitterness, and today India is still a member of the British Commonwealth. There are more Englishmen in India now than there were before Independence and the volume of trade between England and India is larger than it ever was. This is the greatest triumph of Gandhi's doctrine of non-violence.

And this doctrine has been the corner stone of our foreign policy; again and again we have applied it to the situations that have arisen since we became free and have refused to be swerved from the path we have chalked out by any temporary failure.

In the teeth of a great deal of misunderstanding and even hostility in this country, we have adhered to our policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. We have refused to enter into any military alliance or sign any defence pacts with any country. We have regretted the existence of the cold war, but have refused to take sides or increase the climate of tension, on the other hand, we have tried to restrict its area by persuading other countries also to remain unaligned. Many countries in Asia and Africa and even in Europe and South America have now acclaimed our policy and adopted it. Our recent difficulties with China have further underlined the soundness of our policy. It is precisely because we did not belong to either of the powerful groups that we have succeeded in localising the dispute between ourselves and our mighty neighbour. Even the threat to our frontier has not induced us to succumb to the temptation of entering into defence pacts or military alliances with powerful countries. We still believe, as we believed in those far off days, when we were struggling for freedom, that the greatest strength of a country is the determination of its people. We believe that if we have to fight China—and fight we will if the sanctity of our country is violated and every inch of our country is sacred—we will fight her with all that we possess—our large population, our army, our air force, our arms and armament. If this is not enough, we will buy more from

here and elsewhere. But we will not permit foreign armies to fight from our soil or to make our country the base for attacking another country. We have bitter experience from history of how freedom and independence can be jeopardised if you once allow foreign influence to dictate your policy or your defence.

And even while we are preparing ourself against any further aggression from China, we have not given up our belief in the peaceful approach. We are prepared to negotiate with China—the Conference Room is always kept open and we are always prepared to sit down at the same table with our worst enemies.

We were confronted with a similar problem in Kashmir and Goa. Although Kashmir constitutionally and in accordance with international law joined the Indian Union, Pakistan committed aggression against and even today is unlawfully in occupation of a part of Kashmir. At the beginning of this aggression, we could have driven out the soldiers of Pakistan, but it might have led to a conflagration and a war between us and our neighbour. We forbore from doing this and approached the Security Council complaining of Pakistan's aggression. That aggression still continues and the resolution of the Security Council calling upon Pakistan to vacate the aggression has not been given effect to. When some people glibly talk of our equivocal policy with regard to Kashmir, they should remember these salient and undisputed facts. But we are always prepared to discuss the question of Kashmir with Pakistan—but the discussion must be on the basis of our legal sovereignty over Kashmir being recognised by Pakistan—exactly as we want China to recognise certain facts about our undisputed sovereignty over a large part of our frontiers which China wrongfully claims by showing them as her own in certain maps which she has published before we open negotiations with the Chinese authorities.

Towards Portugal too, we have adopted the policy of peaceful approach under grave provocation and even at the risk of displeasing our people whose patience is running out at Portugal's intransigence. After the transfer of power to

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

us by Great Britain, we negotiated a treaty with France by which she transferred her possessions to us. But Portugal thinks she is still living in the Colonial age—and wants to hold on to the few tiny possessions she has in India. We could have cleared this colonial debris long ago, but it would have involved the use of force and we have refused to resort to force. We are confident in the belief that history is against Portugal and she cannot long withstand the historical process which throughout the world is putting an end to colonialism and colonial regimes.

Our policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence is no longer the voice in the wilderness it once was. The opinion in this country has sharply swung in favour of greater and better appreciation of what we stand for. Our policy towards China has won the approbation of no less an authority than President Eisenhower. Your Government as far as I know is strongly supporting a neutral Laos—and the feeling is growing here that it is a mistake to drag Asian and African countries into the welter of East-West politics. With regard to peaceful co-existence, President Eisenhower has given a lead in his recent quest for peace when he visited 11 countries. We have come to realise that we must accept a world where communism and democracy will exist. The only question is whether they will exist peacefully or will they engender more and more hostility with the ultimate result that between them they will blow up the world and put an end to both the experiments—the communist and the democratic.

We are making another great contribution to world affairs by launching upon a great and exciting adventure of bringing prosperity into areas which are under-developed, under-fed and under educated. Two thirds of the world is poor and there is a terrible and dangerous disparity between those who have all the material welfare which modern science and technology can supply and those who live on a per capita income of 100 dollars a year and less. This state of affairs is unsatisfactory not only from the humane point of view but also from the economic and political one. It affects not only the areas concerned but the world as a whole. Poverty

breeds tensions and tensions a revolutionary fervour which seeks to solve insoluble problems by abandoning old and well-tried methods. Nationalism and a free society are not content with the status quo—they compare notes of their own conditions with what is happening in Western countries, in the U S A and in Russia—and the great problem of the decade which has just ended and which will continue to be even a greater problem of the next decade will be how to reconcile freedom with prosperity, how to create not only a free society but a free society which is also a prosperous society. Unless free societies can give prosperity to their people soon, there is every danger of freedom being lost and society becoming regimented and introducing the monolithic state which we find in certain countries. We are apt to forget that to millions of people in the world, bread is more important than freedom. Time is fast running out—and we must devise a global economic policy in which those who have will look upon those who have not, not as a people living on a different planet, not with complacency, because they are well fed and possess everything they desire, not with indifference saying with a shrug “Am I my brother’s keeper?”—but with a deep consciousness that the world is one and indivisible and that you cannot have peace and economic stability in the world so long as you have great wealth in one part and devastating and dehumanising poverty in another. We in India are trying to solve this problem in our own region. While maintaining a free society, we are fighting poverty, raising the standards of life of our people, spreading education and giving to our economy a strong industrial base. What is happening in India is of interest not only to India itself but to the whole world. Our country is half the size of this country and we have a population of 400 millions. We became free only about 12 years ago. The world is watching whether our experiment will succeed. Doubts have been expressed that democracy cannot generate the necessary force to overcome the stupendous problems of a country where the per capita income is 60 dollars, where illiteracy is about 70 percent and where there are millions of unemployed. It is

said that only a powerful and ruthless State which is impervious to human liberty or dignity that can tackle this problem of regimenting the people and coercing them to do what the State wants and not what the people want. This will be the big question mark of the new decade which we are beginning—and the future of Asia and Africa, the future of democracy and the future of freedom will depend upon what answer is furnished, particularly by countries like the U S A, which is so deeply and vitally interested in maintaining free societies all over the world.

India has also been emphasising another important world problem to which, I am afraid, sufficient attention has not been paid in this country. That is the problem of population explosion. The population of the world is increasing fast and the tragedy is that the increase is on a much larger scale in those areas which are under developed. Therefore, population explosion has also other explosive features which are political and economic. We may increase our food production, we may increase our total national produce, your country may give us most massive and generous economic aid, but all this is nullified and wasted if our population increases at the rate at which it is growing—about 7 millions a year. It is true that better standards of life and more education will halt this terrific expansion. But that is not enough—we cannot wait for their slow process. And, therefore, we have officially adopted a policy of birth control and family planning. We propose to spend large amounts in educating our people in the necessity of controlling the family and supplying the means of bringing it about. Japan and Pakistan are the other two countries which have also taken up this question on a governmental level. But much more remains to be done. Just as there is a growing awareness in this country of the need for economic aid to under-developed countries, so also there should be an awareness of the vital necessity of halting the growth of population. If the nuclear bomb frightens us and makes us think of the danger to the whole of humanity in its possible use in the future war, we should not look on

with equanimity on the equally devastating bomb which is exploding all over the world.

In the ultimate analysis, India and U. S. A. constitute two of the greatest democracies in the world and the peoples of these two countries are dedicated to freedom and pledged to uphold the dignity of man and enforce the Rule of Law. In friendship and co-operation, we can do a great deal to solve the problems of the world and to achieve a society in which human beings can hold their heads high and peacefully undertake their pursuit of happiness.

PART III

Progress in Freedom

**WAR
AGAINST
WANT**

WHEN WE TALK OF AID to developing countries we have to be clear in our minds of the nature and extent of aid and the stage of development the recipient country has achieved. This country gave massive aid to a stricken and devastated Europe in the form of Marshall aid. Europe had the industrial potential, the technique and personnel to absorb that aid and produce results which are responsible today for a highly industrialised Europe with a surplus of funds which is causing the dollar gap in this country. The Marshall Plan was conceived in a large way and executed in a grand manner. I do not think public opinion in this country was thinking of future returns. It was partly due to missionary zeal, partly to humanitarian reasons and partly to a clear sighted statesmanship which saw the danger to the world in a festering and economically sick Europe.

The strategic position of India, both political and economic, is no less important today than that of Europe was after the last war. India is the most populous democracy in the world. She is the testing ground of democracy in the whole of Asia. She has maintained a stable and secure government after winning her independence. She has granted and guaranteed to her citizens all the fundamental rights which every individual must enjoy if he has to live in dignity and freedom.

But I must qualify myself. She has not yet succeeded in abolishing poverty and so long as there is destitution and

*Greater Philadelphia Area Committee for
UNICEF, Bellevue Stratford, Philadelphia
Address delivered on February 21, 1961*

unemployment, sickness and illiteracy, mere political rights cannot confer dignity upon the human being. It is difficult to think of dignity when you have to live in a hovel, if you do not have enough to eat and you cannot clothe or educate your children. Therefore the problem of poverty in India is both a political and economic problem. Political because our democratic institutions depend upon our successfully solving the problem of poverty. It is very difficult if not impossible for democracy and freedom to thrive in an atmosphere of sub normal conditions nor is it possible to induce men with empty stomachs to be enthusiastic about the advantages of liberty and representative institutions.

It is in this striking respect that India differs from many other developing countries. She is developing economically in a democratic setting. She wishes to achieve her economic revolution with the consent of her people expressed through a freely elected Parliament and without sacrificing in the process the basic freedoms which are enshrined in her constitution and which are fully safeguarded by an independent judiciary. This casts upon her an almost intolerable burden but she has refused to accept the short cuts suggested by totalitarian methods.

In most Western countries the industrial revolution preceded the political revolution with the consequence that these countries built up their industries when they were not seriously hampered by labour laws, trade unions and constitutional guarantees. Further the British occupation of our country retarded our economic progress by about 200 years. We are, therefore, today engaged in an enterprise which we must accomplish by jumping over two centuries and produce a successful revolution without coercion or compulsion.

How difficult this is can be seen by what happened in Russia and what is happening in China. These countries faced the same problem that we are facing—how quickly and effectively to raise the standards of their people. But the solution they adopted was radically different. To enter the promised land of economic prosperity no sacrifice was too great—and human

suffering paved the way to industrialism and all the fruits of industrialism

Let me show you how differently we are going about our business. We have our plans and planning—a word of bad odour in this country, because it seems to suggest regimentation and forced labour and all the other trappings of an undemocratic society. We have already successfully completed our two five year plans and we are about to launch upon our third. But all our plans are the result of discussion and debate at all levels of our people and before they are ultimately put into execution they must be authorised and sanctioned by our Parliament. It is like a piece of legislation which has been thoroughly investigated by various committees of the Congress and has been passed by the House and the Senate.

Agriculture is our big problem. Apart from the question of food production we had to do social justice to our farmers and our landless workers. We had to do away with absentee landlordism and give security of tenure to the actual tillers of the land and if possible distribute some land to millions who are hungering for some small patch on which they can grow enough for their subsistence. We had therefore to place a ceiling on the holdings of land. This was done by legislation passed by State legislatures. Having done this, we were faced by another problem, the holdings were so small that the farmers could not afford fertilisers, tractors and all the modern mechanical implements of cultivation. We, therefore, started a programme of cooperatives. But mark you, there is no compulsion on any farmer to join a cooperative. It is entirely voluntary. We refuse to herd our farmers into communes as China has done.

To my mind the great question mark of this decade will be whether India can raise the standards of living of her 400 million people who are increasing at the rate of 8 millions every year. On the answer to the question depends the destinies of millions in Asia and Africa for generations to come. Let me postulate the question as clearly as I can. Can a developing country achieve her goal of adequate stand-

ards for her people in this technological age without sacrificing freedom and without a total and ruthless regimentation of her people? I have said that this is the question of this decade—not of two decades, not fifty years or a century. Because, as has so often been said, we are going through a revolution of rising expectations. In this century freedom has come with a rush, colonialism is disappearing from the face of the earth and men everywhere in Asia and Africa have become not only the masters of their own country but masters of their fate. They are comparing the standards of life among their own people with the standards prevailing here and in Europe. And economic progress cannot possibly falter far behind political freedom. These men have suffered too much and too long. Their patience is exhausted and freedom has set aflame in their hearts the passion for human dignity which had been suppressed for centuries. If aid to developing countries has to do any good, it has to be quick, effective and purposeful.

Having said this, I have to examine the nature and extent of aid. My country has received from your country in the last 10 years about 3 billion dollars and there has also been aid given to other developing countries. There have been many Congress investigations about foreign aid and many opinions have been expressed that much of the aid has been wasted or put to bad purposes.

I think the first principle we must bear in mind is that the recipient country should be in a position to absorb the aid given and use it to improve and better its economy. I can say without fear of contradiction that every cent received by India from this country satisfies this principle. There are certain important factors present in India which help industrialisation. We have all the raw materials we need—coal and iron which are most important. We have large rivers which can produce all the power we need through hydro-electric projects. We have plenty of labour—perhaps too much of it. We have trained administrative and industrial personnel which can run our industries. Do not forget that when we become free, we had a highly developed textile in-

dustry, an efficient though small steel industry and also other industries. And we had a highly qualified Civil Service. But there was not a sufficient base of heavy industry to our agriculture. We had too many people on the land and we had to create industries to give them employment. Our problem was the same which you had 150 years ago—to convert an agricultural society into an industrial society. What we need—and desperately need—is capital goods, machines and machinery in which your country is so proficient. How do we get them? Either we buy them ourselves or get dollars from you in loans or otherwise with which to buy them. We would proudly adopt the first alternative if it was possible. It is possible, but at a terrible cost of human happiness. We can further suppress the standards of our people, force them to give to us more and more of what they produce and use this impost to buy these machines. But it would be a heartless and inhuman procedure. The per capita income in India is 60 dollars a year. Where is the scope for saving and investment? Far from robbing our people of what little they have, in the last ten years we have seen to it that consumption per capita has gone up substantially. If you go to India today you will find that the poor people are eating better, have better clothes and many of them even have a bicycle for transport. Thus you see the necessity of aid and you also realise the purpose of the aid.

The second principle I would suggest is that aid should be intended to create a self-generating economy in the recipient country. The country should not get wedded to aid—the whole object should be to be able to do without the aid as soon as possible. That is precisely what we are doing. We are straining every muscle to see that after 10 years we will be self-reliant. Even today, for our Third Five Year Plan, we are dependent only to the extent of about one-sixth of what the plan will cost us for foreign aid. The rest we will find from taxation and our own domestic resources.

Thus the nature of aid must depend upon the stage of development each country has reached. One country may be ready for industrialisation, another country may need educa-

tion and technical experience, a third may need development of raw materials and so on. I will just touch in passing on the controversial question of military aid. It is a question of foreign policy of this country and it would be wrong on my part to be critical of it. But I will only say that very often a poor country cannot afford the luxury of an expensive military establishment, and aid instead of helping the people may lead to making their burden heavier.

The third principle to which I attach great importance is that aid should be given in furtherance of social justice and not to defeat it. If aid results in strengthening a reactionary government, in helping to tighten the fetters upon the people, then the whole purpose and object of aid is defeated. Because aid should be given essentially to help the people of a country to develop economically into prosperity. It may be given to a government, but its target should be welfare of the people.

Applying this principle to the aid received by my country, it has been used wholly for the betterment of our people. Partly it has gone to the public sector and partly to the private sector. But whether in the public sector or in private sector, we have not used it to manufacture cosmetics or luxury goods or to aggrandise any section of the country but it has gone to improve the lot of our poorest people. There is some misunderstanding about the public sector here. It is a mistake to compare the economy of competitive private industry here with the conditions in India. In India only the State can set up the steel mills, the hydro-electric projects, the extension of the railways and the fertiliser plants which the country needs. Further it is only the State that can determine the priorities of production and priorities is a matter of life and death to us. Your affluent society can decide for itself whether it will have more automobiles and washing machines than schools and colleges. We cannot afford to do that. What little national produce we have must be used to the best purpose.

And believe me private industry is doing very well in India. There was a very interesting article in the London Economist

recently where the author points out how the private sector has progressed in India beyond all expectation and has done much better than the share reserved for it by the Government in the national economy. We are also deeply concerned about preventing the concentration of economic power in a few hands. The same writer in the Economist points out that all over India small industries are springing up. They want enough steel and power; and this is where you can help the private industry. By supporting the public sector by financing it you are making it possible for the public sector to give steel and power to these small men. And believe me, I am interested in these small men and the great traditions of this country are in favour of small men. For, witness your anti-trust laws. These are the men who have created the image of America.

I should finally like to say a word about the need of aid being determined on a long term basis rather than on a short term *ad hoc* basis. I think it is desirable from the point of view both of the country giving the aid and the recipient country. From the point of view of the latter, it helps it to know what is the aid it is going to receive over a reasonably long period and to plan accordingly. Many projects take years to complete. If they are started on the basis of aid received in any particular year, it would be a catastrophe if aid is not received in subsequent years to complete it. But there is no guarantee as it would depend upon the authorisation of the Congress every year. From the point of view of the former, it is better that it should have a fairly complete and comprehensive picture of what the aid is going to accomplish rather than a spasmodic conception through aid given *every year without the certainty that it will be repeated in the following year.*

There is much more, I am sure, that can be said about aid. It is one of those perennial topics which raises controversies and on which people take up definite and sometimes rigid attitudes. But I should like to say this in conclusion. Aid should not be given merely as a counterweight to Communist propaganda, although it will definitely stop the advance of

Communism. It should not be given as a favour, because that would create an attitude of condescension on the part of the donor and a feeling of resentment because of obligation conferred on the part of the recipient. Aid should be conceived of, marshaled and organised as an act of faith and an act of statesmanship and this country, very often in its history, has shown that it is capable both of faith and statesmanship.

**PLANNING
FOR
PROSPERITY**

WHEN ONE SPEAKS of political and economic currents in a country, one should not think that these currents run in separate channels and independent of each other. Politics and economics are interconnected and one has a considerable bearing upon the other. It may have been different in the good old or bad old days—what the days were depends upon what your outlook on life is—when the economics of a country were simple and without any ideological or any other complexity. People produced goods, they sold in the best market, the ruling motive was profit and there were no considerations of national economy, the interest of the State, the requirements of foreign exchange. Politics only played a part to the extent that European powers wanted a market for their manufactured goods and cheap labour in colonial countries for obtaining raw materials.

The situation has entirely changed now. It is the political policy of the country, both national and international, that plays the dominant part in moulding and shaping its economic policy. The most conservative country has to take into consideration in determining its economy, the welfare of the State and the community, the interests of labour, the repercussions of trade and commerce upon its international commitments. Therefore, it would be wrong with regard to any country and

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

Communism It should not be given as a favour, because that would create an attitude of condescension on the part of the donor and a feeling of resentment because of obligation conferred on the part of the recipient Aid should be conceived of, marshaled and organised as an act of faith and an act of statesmanship and this country, very often in its history, has shown that it is capable both of faith and statesmanship

PLANNING FOR PROSPERITY

WHEN ONE SPEAKS of political and economic currents in a country, one should not think that these currents run in separate channels and independent of each other. Politics and economics are interconnected and one has a considerable bearing upon the other. It may have been different in the good old or bad old days—what the days were depends upon what your outlook on life is—when the economics of a country were simple and without any ideological or any other complexity. People produced goods, they sold in the best market, the ruling motive was profit and there were no considerations of national economy, the interest of the State, the requirements of foreign exchange. Politics only played a part to the extent that European powers wanted a market for their manufactured goods and cheap labour in colonial countries for obtaining raw materials.

The situation has entirely changed now. It is the political policy of the country, both national and international, that plays the dominant part in moulding and shaping its economic policy. The most conservative country has to take into consideration in determining its economy, the welfare of the State and the community, the interests of labour, the repercussions of trade and commerce upon its international commitments. Therefore, it would be wrong with regard to any country and equally with regard to India to put politics and economics into separate water-tight

our neighbour should be politically and economically strong. The rumblings of thunder that you hear from time to time come from Pakistan and not from our country.

There are two factors which bedevil the relations between Pakistan and ourselves. One is Kashmir and the other is military aid given to Pakistan by the United States. With regard to the first, I find that there is a better understanding in this country about our attitude. The question has been discussed so threadbare that audiences in this country no longer require a detailed discussion. I will only say one or two things on this question. Kashmir is as much a part of India as Texas or New Mexico is part of the U. S. A. Kashmir has prospered as a part of India and her people are happy and contented. We have no iron curtains and I invite anyone here to go and see for himself what the conditions in Kashmir are. Next—democracy like charity should begin at home. It is a piece of gross impertinence for a country which has held no elections for the last 11 years, which has recently scrapped every vestige of democracy to lecture to us and tell us to obtain a democratic verdict from the people of Kashmir by means of a plebiscite.

With regard to military aid to Pakistan, I think there is more and more appreciation here that the only way to help a country to maintain democratic institutions is to give it economic aid. More often than not, subversive dangers arise by reason of the poverty of the people and the underdevelopment of the country rather than through military threat. I think it is, indeed, a curious irony of history that the United States today by giving military aid to Pakistan should be supporting no democratic institutions but a dictatorship. Military aid will very likely strengthen the dictatorship but what is the guarantee that this aid will be used for the restoration of democratic institutions? We in India look upon this aid as a threat to India and for a very good reason because we have been told in no unmistakable terms by Pakistan, that, if necessary, she would wage war with India. I would beg my listeners to pause and consider which is the greater guarantee for peace and democracy in the East—a strong,

our neighbour should be politically and economically strong. The rumblings of thunder that you hear from time to time come from Pakistan and not from our country.

There are two factors which bedevil the relations between Pakistan and ourselves. One is Kashmir and the other is military aid given to Pakistan by the United States. With regard to the first, I find that there is a better understanding in this country about our attitude. The question has been discussed so threadbare that audiences in this country no longer require a detailed discussion. I will only say one or two things on this question. Kashmir is as much a part of India as Texas or New Mexico is part of the U S A. Kashmir has prospered as a part of India and her people are happy and contented. We have no iron curtains and I invite anyone here to go and see for himself what the conditions in Kashmir are. Next—democracy like charity should begin at home. It is a piece of gross impertinence for a country which has held no elections for the last 11 years, which has recently scrapped every vestige of democracy to lecture to us and tell us to obtain a democratic verdict from the people of Kashmir by means of a plebiscite.

With regard to military aid to Pakistan, I think there is more and more appreciation here that the only way to help a country to maintain democratic institutions is to give it economic aid. More often than not, subversive dangers arise by reason of the poverty of the people and the underdevelopment of the country rather than through military threat. I think it is, indeed, a curious irony of history that the United States today by giving military aid to Pakistan should be supporting no democratic institutions but a dictatorship. Military aid will very likely strengthen the dictatorship but what is the guarantee that this aid will be used for the restoration of democratic institutions? We in India look upon this aid as a threat to India and for a very good reason because we have been told in no unmistakable terms by Pakistan, that, if necessary, she would wage war with India. I would beg my listeners to pause and consider which is the greater guarantee for peace and democracy in the East—a strong,

private sector. It will, therefore, be seen that we envisage a future in our country in which both the public and private sectors will cooperate with each other and work hand in hand in order to convert an underdeveloped country into a fully developed and industrialised country.

It is a trite saying that the prosperity of a country must depend upon industrialisation. The country must produce all the machinery that it needs and it must manufacture the tools which will make those machines. The terrific drain on our foreign exchange can only stop when, like the United States or the United Kingdom, we are industrially self-sufficient. That is our target but we do not propose to achieve that target by starving our people of the necessities of life, or by making the worker lose his dignity as a human being; because we realise that in the ultimate analysis it is the freedom and the happiness of the individual that must determine whether the State has properly discharged its function. Therefore, in our Second Five-Year Plan, we have attached as much importance to agriculture, to irrigation as we have to heavy industries. The figures are eloquent—11.8 per cent of our outlay on the Second Five-Year Plan is on agriculture and community development, 19 per cent is on irrigation and power, 19.7 per cent on social services, 28.9 per cent is on transport and communications and only 18.5 per cent on industry and mining. The balance is on other miscellaneous projects.

India is essentially a country of villages and we are devoting all our energies to the improvement of agriculture, to community projects which will introduce better methods of sanitation, give them better health, better roads, more education. We are going a head with our policy of making the villages autonomous through the working of Panchayats

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

powerful, friendly India or a country which has liquidated democracy and which does not believe in peace.

With regard to democracy, I can proudly say that there is no country in the world where the individual is more free, where the dignity of man is more respected, where the rule of law is more strictly prevalent, where the Judiciary is more independent than India.

Turning to the economic aspect, we are engaged in a gigantic project of developing our country. We have successfully completed our First Five-Year Plan and we are now in the midst of the Second Five-Year Plan. This plan represents the collective effort of the Government and the people of a country to fight poverty, to raise the standard of living of 400 million people and to ensure a more equitable distribution of what the country produces. It is a gigantic experiment in democratic planning. We seek to achieve our results by carrying our people with us, with their consent and co-operation and not by exercising compulsion. Just as we believe in non-violence in the political field, so also we believe in it in the economic field.

We also believe in co-existence in the economic field—co-existence between the public and private sectors. It is a total misreading of our economic policy to suggest that private capital has no place in India. Today, in the industrial-

private sector. It will, therefore, be seen that we envisage a future in our country in which both the public and private sectors will cooperate with each other and work hand in hand in order to convert an underdeveloped country into a fully developed and industrialised country.

It is a trite saying that the prosperity of a country must depend upon industrialisation. The country must produce all the machinery that it needs and it must manufacture the tools which will make those machines. The terrific drain on our foreign exchange can only stop when, like the United States or the United Kingdom, we are industrially self-sufficient. That is our target but we do not propose to achieve that target by starving our people of the necessities of life, or by making the worker lose his dignity as a human being; because we realise that in the ultimate analysis it is the freedom and the happiness of the individual that must determine whether the State has properly discharged its function. Therefore, in our Second Five-Year Plan, we have attached as much importance to agriculture, to irrigation as we have to heavy industries. The figures are eloquent—11.8 per cent of our outlay on the Second Five-Year Plan is on agriculture and community development, 19 per cent is on irrigation and power, 19.7 per cent on social services, 28.9 per cent is on transport and communications and only 18.5 per cent on industry and mining. The balance is on other miscellaneous projects.

India is essentially a country of villages and we are devoting all our energies to the improvement of agriculture, to community projects which will introduce better methods of sanitation, give them better health, better roads, more education. We are going a head with our policy of making the villages autonomous through the working of Panchayats which are elected Village Councils. We are carrying through an impressive land policy. For hundreds of years the tillers of the soil were treated like serfs. We are giving them the land which were in their occupation and which they cultivated and as there is not enough land to go around, we have fixed a ceiling beyond which land cannot be possessed by anyone. This ceiling is based on a practical consideration of what an

powerful, friendly India or a country which has liquidated democracy and which does not believe in peace.

With regard to democracy, I can proudly say that there is no country in the world where the individual is more free, where the dignity of man is more respected, where the rule of law is more strictly prevalent, where the Judiciary is more independent than India.

Turning to the economic aspect, we are engaged in a gigantic project of developing our country. We have successfully completed our First Five-Year Plan and we are now in the midst of the Second Five-Year Plan. This plan represents the collective effort of the Government and the people of a country to fight poverty, to raise the standard of living of 400 million people and to ensure a more equitable distribution of what the country produces. It is a gigantic experiment in democratic planning. We seek to achieve our results by carrying our people with us, with their consent and co-operation and not by exercising compulsion. Just as we believe in non-violence in the political field, so also we believe in it in the economic field.

We also believe in co-existence in the economic field—co-existence between the public and private sectors. It is a total misreading of our economic policy to suggest that private capital has no place in India. Today, in the industrialisation of India, private capital is playing a big part and will continue to play a big part. But private capital, like any other institution, must serve the interests of the nation. It cannot be permitted to take up a position which would militate against the progress and prosperity of the country. Therefore, in our Second Five-Year Plan, we have carved out three separate specific spheres, one which comprises production of goods which are basic in their character as far as the security and well-being of the country is concerned, as for example, steel, and this sphere is reserved for the public sector. But even here we are not going to disturb private enterprise to the extent that it already exists. The second sphere is one in which both public and the private sectors will cooperate and the third is a sphere which is left wholly to the

private sector. It will, therefore, be seen that we envisage a future in our country in which both the public and private sectors will cooperate with each other and work hand in hand in order to convert an underdeveloped country into a fully developed and industrialised country.

It is a trite saying that the prosperity of a country must depend upon industrialisation. The country must produce all the machinery that it needs and it must manufacture the tools which will make those machines. The terrific drain on our foreign exchange can only stop when, like the United States or the United Kingdom, we are industrially self-sufficient. That is our target but we do not propose to achieve that target by starving our people of the necessities of life, or by making the worker lose his dignity as a human being; because we realise that in the ultimate analysis it is the freedom and the happiness of the individual that must determine whether the State has properly discharged its function. Therefore, in our Second Five-Year Plan, we have attached as much importance to agriculture, to irrigation as we have to heavy industries. The figures are eloquent—11.8 per cent of our outlay on the Second Five-Year Plan is on agriculture and community development, 19 per cent is on irrigation and power, 19.7 per cent on social services, 28.9 per cent is on transport and communications and only 18.5 per cent on industry and mining. The balance is on other miscellaneous projects.

India is essentially a country of villages and we are devoting all our energies to the improvement of agriculture, to community projects which will introduce better methods of sanitation, give them better health, better roads, more education. We are going ahead with our policy of making the villages autonomous through the working of Panchayats which are elected Village Councils. We are carrying through an impressive land policy. For hundreds of years the tillers of the soil were treated like serfs. We are giving them the land which were in their occupation and which they cultivated and as there is not enough land to go around, we have fixed a ceiling beyond which land cannot be possessed by anyone. This ceiling is based on a practical consideration of what an

individual along with the members of the family can cultivate. In other words, we are transforming the Indian rural scene by making the country a country of peasant proprietors. But this has raised another serious problem. If the holding of a peasant proprietor is small, it is not possible for him to introduce modern methods of cultivation, to employ tractors, good seeds, good fertilisers and so on. Therefore, we are encouraging cooperative farming. We are persuading our farmers to cooperate with each other in tilling their respective lands so that the best results could be produced.

Someone will say that this is socialism and socialism is a word of bad odour in this country. It is undoubtedly true that we are working for a socialist pattern of society but people have a habit of running away with catch-words without understanding the true implication of a particular phrase or expression. When we say that we are going to achieve a socialist pattern of society, what we mean is that we are going to fight poverty, that we are going to see that social and economic justice is done to every citizen, that every citizen gets education, employment and is assured a minimum standard of living, and that we will not tolerate or countenance any economic theory which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. We do not wish to deprive any one of the fruits of his labour but we wish to see that there is a fairer and more equitable distribution of what the country produces and can produce.

I would like to make one or two general observations which have some bearing on the economic policy of this country. Today, in my opinion, the world is divided between developed and underdeveloped countries and many of our economic and political tensions are due to this fact. Prosperity like peace is indivisible and we cannot have real prosperity in one part of the world if there is poverty and squalor in another part. Therefore, if the United States is interested in her prosperity, she must inevitably be interested in the prosperity of the whole world.

I know how vividly the United States of America is interested in the democratic experiment that is going on in

India. For the first time in the history of the world, a nation of 400 million people who has just emerged from her colonial existence has solemnly decided not only to be free but to be prosperous—prosperous through discussion and debate, through legislation passed by a Parliament elected by adult suffrage, prosperous while maintaining the rule of law and the freedom of the individual. I am not going to say that India wants help from the United States. Help is a word which has most unfortunate connotations. It puts the country helped under a sense of obligation. It produces a sense of patronage in the country which gives the help. I would rather suggest that this is the time when there should be economic cooperation between India and the United States. The cooperation can be both on governmental level and on the level of private enterprise. On the governmental level there are the various loans which have been advanced by the Government of the United States. In this connection, I should like to mention what an American publicist said the other day. He pointed out that in America's early history loans were advanced by European Powers to her but they were long-dated loans so that the United States had sufficient time to repay them. Industrialisation takes time and still more time is needed before one reaps the fruits of industrialisation, and I sincerely hope that this fact will be borne in mind in future when we have discussions about loans to be made by Government here. Even perhaps more important and of a more abiding interest is trade and commerce between our two countries. I do not think that all the possibilities have been fully explored. I think India has much to offer to the United States in return for what she requires from this country. Trade and commerce must always be a two-way traffic and it would never do for us to buy capital goods from the United States unless the United States is prepared to accept from us what we can offer and what can fit into your large and expanding economy.

I am equally interested in investment of private capital. I think there is a great field for cooperation between Indian and American capital in many departments. I have noticed

PART IV

Issues of Conscience

POPULATION EXPLOSION

WHEN THE ATOMIC BOMB exploded over Hiroshima, millions of people felt that a new chapter was opening in human history which was fraught with the most serious and dangerous consequences. From the Atomic Age we have proceeded to the Nuclear Age and we are now beginning to realize that we have armed ourselves with weapons which, if not controlled, may destroy the whole of our civilization and reduce such human beings as might be left to the worst horrors of a dark age.

But it is indeed surprising that we have paid no attention to another explosion that is taking place around us and which has equally serious consequences. That is the population explosion. The population of the world is increasing at a rapid rate and the increase is greater in countries which can least afford to have a larger population than in countries which are prosperous and which have still uninhabited areas.

Let me only give a few of the important figures. The population of the world has increased from about 500 million in the 17th Century to about three billion at present. In my own country, the population is about 400 million, and the population is increasing at the rate of eight million a year. China, the great question mark of tomorrow, has a population of 600 million which is also rapidly increasing.

The tremendous progress that India has made in improving the standards of life and sanitation has had a rather ironic result. The death rate in India, which a

*National Conference on the Population Crisis
Dallas, Tex
Address delivered on May 17, 1960*

few years ago was about 30 per thousand, has gone down to 20. The birth rate today is about 40 per thousand. The result is a continuous and steady increase in population.

If modern civilisation has come to India in the shape of better medicine, better surgery, better knowledge about the after-care of children, civilisation cannot be permitted to stop there. Modern civilisation also teaches us, or should teach us, how to plan one's family, how to limit the number of one's children so that one can afford to bring them up with at least a minimum of the care and consideration which they need.

If, therefore, this country is interested in the health projects in India, and I know how interested this country is because not only we have had economic assistance from the Government but also from your foundations to push through our health projects, it is to my mind logical that this country should also be vitally interested in seeing that the population of India is maintained at a certain level and is not allowed to expand at a rate which would stultify all measures taken to improve the health of the people. It is criminal to make people live longer so that they could produce more children who would lower the standards not only of their parents but also the standards of the country as a whole.

The same nightmare haunts our food situation in India. India is a country of villages. We have 700,000 villages and the overwhelming majority of our people are engaged in agricultural pursuits. Therefore, improvement in agriculture and increased food production are vital to our progress. Last year we produced what is a record of 73,000,000 tons and we hope to produce between 100 to 110 million tons within the next five years. You must have seen the report of the Ford Foundation which takes a rather pessimistic view and expresses the opinion that by 1966 there will be a shortage of 28,000,000 tons in India. Apart from our own production, we have been importing from this country about three million tons a year under Public Law 480. The provisions of this Law are that the American Government gives us dollars to purchase this wheat out of your enormous reserves. Prac-

tically 50 percent of this dollar payment is a grant to India. The rest is a loan repayable in rupees.

With all this, there is still food shortage in India. It is partly due to the fact that our farmers are eating more than they ate before which is undoubtedly a good thing, because even today the average calory consumption of an Indian is only 2,000 as compared to 3,000 in this country. Not being a totalitarian country, we cannot force our people to eat less so that there would be more food available for distribution. But there is a more serious reason why our food production is lagging behind, and that is, the constant and continuous increase of population. We grow more food and the population catches up with the increase.

The main reason in India for industrialisation is to give agriculture an industrial base, because it is only when there is such an industrial base that people could be taken off the land and employed in industries. Industrialisation could create a large number of industries around the villages where the villagers could be profitably employed, because our lands are over-populated and there is not enough work for full-time employment of our farmers.

We have received massive aid from this country in helping us to industrialise our country, but this economic aid will only bear fruit and produce full results if we can arrest the growth of our population. Therefore, it seems to me that if the United States is interested in seeing India an industrial and prosperous country, its interests should not stop at giving aid for setting up factories and mills, in putting up irrigation and power projects, but its interests should extend to seeing that the problem of population is effectively tackled.

Now we are one of the few countries in the world which has officially at Governmental level adopted the policy of birth control and family planning. We are very fortunate that there has not been much serious religious objection in India. But the task of spreading the gospel of birth control and family planning is a Herculean one and we have only made a beginning. Although the first birth control clinic was opened in India in 1925, today we have only about 2,500 clinics giving

family planning advice and giving free contraceptives. We have earmarked a sum of about \$200,000,000 in our Third Five-Year Plan. What we want to achieve is to cut down our present birth rate by at least half.

You might ask me what this country can do to help the Government and people of India. I think what we really need in India today is a cheap oral contraceptive. It should be so cheap that it would be possible to sell these pills as widely as quinine or aspirin is sold in India today. We can flood the country with these pills and induce our people to take them just as we have induced them to take quinine or aspirin for the good of their health. I know that private agencies in this country have been working at producing such a pill, but unless Government here officially steps in the help that we would expect from this country would indeed be infinitesimal.

If the Government gives the green signal, then India can benefit by all the scientific knowledge that this country has and help us to produce either the cheap oral contraceptive I have been speaking about or something equally cheap and effective. I could have understood the Government's attitude here if India had not officially announced its policy in favour of birth control. Then it might have been said that this country was forcing its ideas upon India and interfering in its internal and domestic problems. But I fail to see how there can be any resentment or misunderstanding on the part of our Government when we ourselves realise the gravity of the situation and want to take every step to further our program. If we are prepared to take loans and grants from you, if we are prepared to take from you wheat which is lying in reserve, I am sure that we would be equally willing to take the benefit of your advance—scientific and technical knowledge—which can help us to surmount this tremendous obstacle which stands in the way of our becoming a highly industrialised and prosperous country.

This country says that she wants to remain neutral on the question of birth control and family planning in India. I say to you with all the emphasis that I can command that on a

question like this, a great country like the United States cannot afford to be neutral. You must make up your mind on which side of this controversy you are on. Can we afford to be neutrals on the question of the nuclear bomb? We all know what a war fought with nuclear bombs would mean. It would mean the destruction of millions of human beings. But the bomb can only destroy the body. Population explosion can do much worse. It can destroy the soul and degrade the dignity of the human being.

I want you to imagine, because in a progressive country like this it requires an act of imagination and deep insight, what it means for millions of children to be born in underdeveloped countries, children who will suffer from malnutrition, who may have no proper homes to live in, who may have no employment when they grow up and may spend their lives as disgruntled, dissatisfied and bitter human beings—a prey to any new idea which might promise them better prospects and more tolerable conditions.

I must frankly confess that I am very impatient of the arguments which are advanced against birth control and family planning on the grounds of morality, and I hope you will forgive me if I speak frankly and bluntly. What is this morality which condemns millions of children to poverty and destitution? Is it moral that children should be born into this abject condition or is it more moral that children should not be born at all?

I have heard it said that it is strange that a country which believes in the Gandhian philosophy of non-violence should be advocating a policy which is tantamount to violence and takes away life. In that sense, nature herself is violent. She destroys millions of sperms and all that human contrivance does is to destroy the one sperm which ultimately fructifies. I think it is better not to be born than to be born to live a life where there is no human dignity.

In advocating the cause of birth control and family planning, I must not overlook another important factor which also leads to decrease in birth rate in a country. If the standards of life of a people go up, there is naturally and inevitably a

tendency for the size of the family to be reduced. Therefore, in India, we must not concentrate solely on the physical aspects of birth control and family planning. We must also emphasise the economic aspect of this problem. It would not do for India to set up birth control clinics and provide for the distribution of contraceptives if she continues to remain an underdeveloped country and the standard of life continues to be the same as it is today. We have, therefore, to see that our policy and program is a double-edged one. While pushing ahead with birth control and family planning, we must also continue with our economic advance and industrial expansion.

Throughout history, the United States has espoused many noble causes. This country has always shown a great deal of altruism and deep sympathy for human suffering. Its Marshall Plan, its Point IV Program, its program for Mutual Aid, etc., all bear testimony to this fact. I think there still remains a great cause about which this country has been indifferent and that is the cause of controlling population throughout the world.

It is not an Indian problem, it is not a problem peculiar to any country. To my mind, it is one of the greatest dangers that the world faces, a danger which, if not met, will result in untold human misery and suffering. I wish to appeal to this country and to the people of this country seriously to think about this matter and to make it a national issue, just as this nation as a whole was behind other important and noble projects.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

WE HAVE MET here this evening to pay a tribute to Mrs Sanger, a truly great woman. The expression "great" is often used lightly and we attribute that quality to many people who least deserve it. In considering whether a person is entitled to that attribute, one must consider how far he or she has advanced the welfare of society and what contribution he or she has made to alleviate human suffering and lessen the burden that every man or woman has to carry through life. In applying this test to Mrs Sanger, there can be no doubt that the pioneer work done by her in the cause of birth control, prevention of population explosion or family planning is truly great.

In passing I might like to refer to these three different expressions that I have used—birth control, prevention of population explosion and family planning, in essence they mean the same thing. We use them according as to whether we are courageous or timid advocates of the same cause, whether we like to speak sotto voce or shout our faith and our creed from the house tops.

When we think of Mrs Sanger, let us remember how the thinking on the subject has changed in this country in the last thirty or forty years. There was a time when to mention birth control was considered not respectable. Not only that, it was considered immoral and it was sometimes even illegal. Such a subject was supposed to be discussed

*Testimonial Dinner in Honour of
Mrs Margret Sanger
Address delivered on May 11 1961*

tendency for the size of the family to be reduced. Therefore, in India, we must not concentrate solely on the physical aspects of birth control and family planning. We must also emphasise the economic aspect of this problem. It would not do for India to set up birth control clinics and provide for the distribution of contraceptives if she continues to remain an underdeveloped country and the standard of life continues to be the same as it is today. We have, therefore, to see that our policy and program is a double-edged one. While pushing ahead with birth control and family planning, we must also continue with our economic advance and industrial expansion.

Throughout history, the United States has espoused many noble causes. This country has always shown a great deal of altruism and deep sympathy for human suffering. Its Marshall Plan, its Point IV Program, its program for Mutual Aid, etc., all bear testimony to this fact. I think there still remains a great cause about which this country has been indifferent and that is the cause of controlling population throughout the world.

It is not an Indian problem, it is not a problem peculiar to any country. To my mind, it is one of the greatest dangers that the world faces, a danger which, if not met, will result in untold human misery and suffering. I wish to appeal to this country and to the people of this country seriously to think about this matter and to make it a national issue, just as this nation as a whole was behind other important and noble projects.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

WE HAVE MET here this evening to pay a tribute to Mrs Sanger, a truly great woman. The expression 'great' is often used lightly and we attribute that quality to many people who least deserve it. In considering whether a person is entitled to that attribute, one must consider how far he or she has advanced the welfare of society and what contribution he or she has made to alleviate human suffering and lessen the burden that every man or woman has to carry through life. In applying this test to Mrs Sanger, there can be no doubt that the pioneer work done by her in the cause of birth control, prevention of population explosion or family planning is truly great.

In passing I might like to refer to these three different expressions that I have used—birth control, prevention of population explosion and family planning. In essence they mean the same thing. We use them according as to whether we are courageous or timid advocates of the same cause, whether we like to speak *sotto voce* or shout our faith and our creed from the house tops.

When we think of Mrs Sanger let us remember how the thinking on the subject has changed in this country in the last thirty or forty years. There was a time when to mention birth control was considered not respectable. Not only that, it was considered immoral and it was sometimes even illegal. Such a subject was supposed to be discussed

*Testimonial Dinner in Honor of
Mrs Margaret Sanger
Address delivered on May 11, 1961*

in small esoteric circles where doubtful intellectuals and high browed people met to exchange ideas about matters which were not supposed to be the concern by and large of the people of this country. The population explosion which was taking place was hardly heard on these shores. In any case, it was something completely remote and far away.

Birth control or family planning was not supposed to be a necessity here. This was a large and flourishing country with wide open spaces, indeed a truly affluent society. Hunger was no problem so much so that the real problem was not shortage of food but excess of it with the result that food had sometimes to be burnt and in any case it could always be given away. The threat of Communism had not yet arisen in acute form and people did not have to think of what growth of population meant when it added millions of unemployed, starving and frustrated people to the world. Mrs Sanger preached her message with a deep insight into the future. As all great people, she had a prophetic vision and long before others she saw the dangers of population explosion, as scientists saw the terrible and ghastly possibilities of atomic explosion.

I would like to look upon this problem of birth control as a human problem, shorn of its technicalities and the impressive statistics which are always brought up when this subject is discussed. Our sympathies are always excited when we hear of disease, famine, epidemic or suffering. We think of death and death is always a frightening thought, although it is the only certain thing in this uncertain world. We are always anxious to fight death and if we cannot succeed in conquering it, we want at least to postpone it as long as possible, and, may I say so, that no country has done more, has shown greater missionary zeal, than this country in trying to abolish sickness and disease. There are large and important national institutions of research which every day are discovering new and cheaper cures for different diseases. The Government here spends millions of dollars to finance these institutions and support their research. But strangely enough, people here turn away with indifference from the most terrible malady from which humanity is suffering today.

We are glibly told that birth control means prevention of births not deaths, that it is irreligious and immoral to interfere with the ways of Providence that we must trust a benevolent Providence to look after the increasing population and that God will feed every mouth that is brought into this world.

I wish to say this emphatically that there is no more wicked or cruel belief than this. Today two thirds of the world's population is underdeveloped and population in those areas is increasing at a faster rate than in developing countries. Is it true that every young mouth in these underdeveloped countries gets sufficient food?

But food is not everything. Even stray dogs on the road find some garbage to satisfy their appetites. If you bring human beings into this world you must invest them with human dignity. We all proudly believe that man is the lord of creation. If that is so then he must live according to the stature he has given to himself. Not only must he have food, he must have shelter, he must have education, he must have gainful employment. How many of the children who are being born this very minute will have all these?

By this terrific and explosive increase in population, not only are we bringing into this world children who will never have the minimum benefits and advantages to which every human being is entitled to, but we are increasing tensions and conflicts and political problems from which the world is suffering. By uncontrolled population increase we are increasing the sense of bitterness and frustration. We are making people lose faith in democracy and we are jeopardising freedom and we are exposing millions to the will of the wisp of totalitarian doctrines. It is apt to be forgotten that democracy and freedom do not function in a vacuum. It will need strong hands to maintain them and it is absurd to expect that they can be safe with people whose primary concern is how to fight hunger and how to get at least one square meal a day. It is indeed ironical to build up military bases and enter into military alliances in defence of democracy when you allow the barricades to be overrun by advancing population.

The role of civilisation in underdeveloped countries is n

subject over which we may well ponder. To my mind, it has advanced only on one front. It has brought about improvement in medical science and public health. It has advanced the age of expectancy of life, it has reduced child mortality. The inevitable result is that more children live after child birth and people live longer than they used to. Civilisation has in effect prevented nature from dealing with the increasing population. Nature in her ruthless and amoral way used to redress the balance by plagues and epidemics and men used to help her by having small wars on their own. Plagues and epidemics have gone and small wars have become out of fashion, the only war we want to wage is an atomic war which will solve the problem of population control for all time. But civilisation has interfered with nature and having brought great boons to people has refused or has hesitated to play the other role of nature. That role should be to restrict birth by artificial means. In doing so, we are undoubtedly interfering with the laws of nature. But we are not doing this more than when we improve and increase life by means of modern science and technology.

The situation today is that to prolong life has become cheap and easy, such great strides have been taken in medical science. But to prevent superficial births—a source of great danger and explosive potentiality—is difficult and expensive. It is difficult and expensive because we do not attach as much importance to the latter as we do to the former.

Turning to my own country, the increase in population has been immense. In 1911, it was 250 million, in 1951, 356 million and, as the census which was recently taken shows in this year, our population has reached 438 million in the last decade 1951-1961. The increase has been approximately 25 percent. The rate of population growth in this decade has been 61 percent faster than the rate in the previous decade. It is not as if we are not conscious of the tremendous problem these figures pose for us. Our Government has officially supported the policy of birth control. In our second Five Year Plan we had allocated 10 million dollars for family planning and in the third Five Year Plan we have allocated 52 million dollars

The birth control clinics have risen from 147 in 1956 to 3,000 today. There were 7,823 sterilisations in 1956 and 41,091 in 1960. The sale of contraceptive goods have gone up six times from 1956 to 1958. Contraceptives are given free to people with an income of \$60 a month. But all this is not enough.

We have received from this country foreign aid to the extent of 3 billion dollars since our independence. It was a generous gesture on the part of this country. It was also wise and statesmanlike because this country realised the importance of economic advance in India in a democratic set up. India was trying to demonstrate to the world that a poor underdeveloped country can become prosperous without sacrificing freedom or democratic institutions. But the effect of this aid is, to a large extent, being nullified by the increase in population. Look at what has happened recently. We have just launched our Third Five-Year Plan. All our calculations and our projects were based on the assumption that in 1961 our population will be 430 million but in the census figures that were published, we found that we had gone wrong because the population was 438 million and not 430 million. Can you imagine what it means to provide food, employment, education to 8 million more people?

It is said that proper and human remedies for overpopulation is not birth control but increase in food production and industrialisation. We are doing both but that is not enough. We cannot allow our increase in population to catch up with whatever advance we might make on the food and industrial fronts. All the time we cannot be looking behind us watching the spectre at our heels trying to frustrate whatever we might seek to achieve.

My purpose in being here this evening, apart from paying a tribute to Mrs. Sanger, is to rouse the conscience of the American public. I think there is no public in any country, once its conscience is aroused, which will fight evil with a greater sense of dedication than public of this country. I want to convince the public that overpopulation is an evil, a terrible evil and it has to be fought with the same zeal with which you have fought maladies like malaria, cholera and

plague I want the national health institutions here to carry on research on how to fight this evil, how to find ways and means to prevent this population explosion. We must get the United Nations interested in this global problem. The United Nations has realised the danger of atomic explosion. Let it realise the danger of the other explosion. The atomic explosion may blow up the world, but we can still trust in the wisdom of our statesmen to arrive at some agreement to control atomic armament, but the population explosion which goes on every day and every minute is serious, sinister and malignant. It cannot be stopped by agreement or treaties but only by great act of faith, followed by a determination to see that the faith is justified by determined and immediate action.

PART V

Our Two Democracies

THIS IS THE FIRST TIME I am addressing an American audience after I came here as Ambassador. I am sure the audience does not expect of me eloquence or oratorical flourishes. I propose to speak to you simply, frankly and genuinely. I think this is a much better way of putting one's ideas across than by using the art and artifices of a platform speaker.

The first point I wish to emphasise is the friendship and goodwill I have noticed in this country for the people of India. There is a genuine warmth in your feelings towards us. I can truthfully say that there never has been a time when the relations between your country and mine have been more cordial.

I have never been able to understand why our relations should be any different. We have differed in the past and we differ now from you on some matters. But true friendship does not require a complete identity of thought and ideas. It is not possible between two individuals, much less between two independent nations. What is necessary is that different views must be honestly held and frankly expressed. But what contributes to true friendship is a common belief in the basic things of life—a common approach to vital problems, a sharing together of values and principles which guide and control our actions and motives. In this sense, the friendship between your country and mine should be a strong and abiding one.

You and we cherish individual freedom. Although we are trying to build up a strong, modern and powerful State we never let ourselves forget that the State exists for the individual and not the individual for the State. We could achieve our objective much more

quickly if we set up a dictatorship and rule by decrees and ride roughshod over the rights of individuals. We refuse to do so. We prefer the slower and more democratic method. Our Constitution embodies the fundamental inalienable rights of citizens which cannot be taken away by the Government or the Legislature. All that your Founding Fathers have written in your Constitution and of which you are justly proud is also a part of our Constitution. You must have read recently about our Prime Minister's exposition of our agricultural policy. We have recently carried out important land reforms. We have done away with absentee landlordism, we have given to the tenant status and security, but in order that we should increase our production, we want our villagers to combine so that it might be possible to till the land by more modern methods by using tractors and better fertilizers. But we don't *compel* our farmers to combine. We persuade them to till the land on a cooperative basis. We confer more power on *village panchayats* which are bodies elected by the villagers so that there should be autonomy in the village and people should solve their problems by their own initiative and effort and not by the compulsion of legislation.

As we believe in individual freedom, so also do we believe in the dignity of the individual and in the worth and value of every human soul. We have abolished untouchability and made it penal for anyone to deny to any citizen however low or humble his rights as a citizen. I am sure I need not explain this aspect of the matter in the country of Abraham Lincoln. Twelve years ago, I came to this country as a delegate to the United Nations to fight racial discrimination practised in South Africa. I am glad to find that this year the United States has voted with India against apartheid, which is a short name for racial intolerance and arrogance.

We believe in the rule of law to the same extent that you do. In our country there is complete equality before the law. Every citizen whatever his race, religion or caste has the same rights. The Constitution is supreme and every organ of the State functions under it. The Judiciary is the custodian of the fundamental rights of the citizens, and I can say this with

confidence because I was Chief Justice of Bomhay till a month ago that the Judges in India have been independent and impartial and in innumerable cases have upheld the liberty of the subject against the encroachment of the Executive. Our Courts have the same right of judicial review which your courts have, and they constantly pronounce on the constitutionality or otherwise of laws passed by the legislature.

But more than all this, we fervently and passionately believe in democracy. We have kept the flag of democracy flying in the East. You will realise the significance of this statement when you remember that all around us democracies are being smothered or liquidated. We are today the standard bearer and the only bastion of democracy in Asia. Since the last war, many countries have attained freedom. Ours is the only country which has enjoyed a stable government—with a Prime Minister who has been in power for eleven years and who has been raised to that power and maintained in that power not by a *coup d'état*, not by any military power but by the suffrage of his people.

Let me try and answer some of the criticisms I have heard about India in this country. I have been told that we are neutral and that we do not wholeheartedly support the side that stands for freedom and peace. That sentiment, I think, is based on a total misconception of India's foreign policy. It is a dynamic foreign policy. Whatever we may be, we are certainly not neutral. We are passionately devoted to the cause of peace. We are one hundred per cent partisan as far as that is concerned. We are equally devoted to the cause of freedom. We hate cruelty, tyranny, oppression. We genuinely believe that the human spirit can only flower in an *atmosphere of freedom*. That is why we shook off the colonial yoke of Great Britain and support the cause of anti-colonialism all the world over.

We have been accused of not allying ourselves with one side or the other in this cold war which is unfortunately going on in Europe. Our belief in co-existence is not a philosophy of weakness or despair. It is, so we think, a philosophy which alone can relieve the tension and remove fear and suspicion.

from which the world so woefully suffers today. We believe that tolerance and understanding are the only qualities that can resolve the conflict between two mighty groups of Powers. In being friendly with Russia and China, we do not accept their ideology, nor their ideas of statecraft. It is for the Russians and Chinese to judge whether these are suited to their own conditions and whether in the ultimate analysis these will lead to the happiness of the individual. But so long as they do not interfere with our internal security or our domestic policies, we have no quarrel with them. I am afraid that some of my American friends who attack our policy of co-existence have not looked at the map of India. Russia and China are right on our frontiers. Is it in the interest of peace that we should be on bad terms with our neighbors or that we should have friendly relations with them? Our policy of co-existence also permits us to take an impartial view of various policies that are being discussed, and supports that which is most conducive to peace. I venture to suggest that this also gives a large country like India a tremendous advantage in international counsels—she has often been able to offer her good offices to bring about a settlement between the opposing parties.

I have been told that our democratic faith is tepid because our Government believes in Socialism and works for a Socialist pattern of society. I am proud to say that we do. But what does socialism mean in the context of India? We are not wedded to any "isms", but in the preamble of our Constitution we have proclaimed that we will give to our people social and economic justice. In India, democracy and freedom are empty words if they do not eliminate poverty and destitution, give food and shelter to our people, raise their standard of living. We judge every institution by the test of the social purpose it serves. If it harms the progress of the common man, if it prevents the progress of the country, then we restrict and control the working of that institution, and even in extreme cases prevent its working altogether. But we don't make a fetish of nationalisation or any other dogma. If you think about it, without perhaps knowing it or realizing it, you

yourself are a Socialist country. Look at the number of laws which you have passed to prevent the free play of economic laws and the working of free enterprise. In my country, private capital and government-owned enterprises work hand-in-hand to produce the result which both have at heart—the prosperity of the country.

The Communist Government in Kerala has often been pointed at as a straw showing which way the wind is blowing in India. To my mind, Kerala is the finest instance of the working of democracy in India. In perfectly free elections the people through the ballot box elected a Communist Government. It is a tribute to the Congress Party that although it was in overwhelming strength all over the country, it did not rig up the elections in Kerala. It did the proper democratic thing—let the people have a free choice. Do you blame our Government for it? Incidentally, we have in Kerala the most unusual phenomenon of a Communist Government functioning through Parliamentary institutions.

It is also my duty to point out what has caused irritation and uneasiness in Indian minds with regard to American policy. In one word, it is the policy of military alliances with countries which are hostile to us, which day in and day out indulge in war cries against us. I may be wrong but it seems to me obvious that the United States is undoing with one hand in India what she is doing with the other. She is pouring millions and billions of dollars into India to help her to organise herself industrially. At the same time, by giving arms to countries hostile to us, she is compelling us to spend more and more on our defense and this diverts our resources from being used for the good of our people to building up arms and armaments. We are told that your Government has made it clear that American arms will not be used against India. Well, we can't take the risk. If we find a country building itself up militarily and threatening us with war, are we to sit with our hands folded and depend merely upon the sanctity of promises?

But let me end on a note of serious reflection about the future. We in India are bent upon a great enterprise—an exciting adventure—of eliminating poverty, of converting an

underdeveloped country into a fully developed and industrialized one. But the enterprise is of vital importance from your point of view because we wish to achieve our goal by democratic methods. Our neighboring countries—Russia and China—are doing the same and doing it quickly and effectively but by means which we do not accept. Our people are watching and waiting—they want to know and know quickly whether democracy can remedy the ills and diseases of a society which has been backward, which is vastly populated and whose progress has been retarded by the colonial yoke. Russia and China emphatically assert that these ills and diseases can only be cured by Communism. We are trying to give a different answer. Our answer is that we can bring about an economic and social revolution by peaceful democratic methods, without using coercion, without sacrificing individual liberty, and preserving and maintaining the rule of law. Democracy is on its trial in India. If democracy fails to produce results as effectively as Communism, democracy will be extinguished in the East and millions of people will cease to worship at the altar of democracy. My appeal to you is to help us to prove that democracy is not only suited to highly industrialised countries like England and United States but also to underdeveloped countries like India, that democracy is not a luxury which only the prosperous can indulge in—it is a way of life, a deep and abiding faith which is equally the privilege of poor countries struggling to achieve prosperity and to do social and economic justice to her people. It is in this that the United States aid to India assumes so vital an aspect. It is not an aid to India, it is not an aid to the people of India. It is an aid to the cause of democracy itself. We are fighting for democracy. We want you to be our allies in that fight. You expended billions of dollars and gave the lives of tens of thousands of young Americans in the last war to save freedom. The war we are waging in India is no less important. It is a war against poverty, a war against social and economic injustice, it is a war for individual freedom. Is America going to be neutral in this war? America has already given the answer by the aid she has

already given to India. We deeply appreciate all that you have done and are doing. But it is not enough. Time is fast running out—and the cause of democracy is in imminent danger. My appeal to you is to look upon economic aid to India as your contribution to the democratic cause. If the cause of democracy succeeds in India, the United States will have in India a powerful and trusted friend pledged to support democracy, and this without any military pact or any pact whatever.

A CONSTITUTION of a country does not spring ready-made like Minerva from the head of Jove. It is either the result of a revolution or a part of the continuity of its history. If it is the result of a revolution, the Constitution bears traces of the revolutionary ideals of the people. If it is the result of mere evolution, then it gives indications of its past history. In the case of India, whose Constitution was enacted in 1949, it was the result both of a peaceful revolution led by Mahatma Gandhi and also the result of transfer of power by Great Britain which meant that there was no break in the continuity of its history.

A Constitution also embodies the aims and aspirations a people seek to achieve and the mechanism by which that can be done. Our Constitution graphically and eloquently in its preamble lays down the objectives for which the Constitution was enacted and these are: To constitute India into a Sovereign Democratic Republic, to secure to all its citizens social, economic and political justice, liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship, equality of status and of opportunity, and to promote among them all fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the Nation.

Our Constitution sets up a Democratic State. The democratic form of Government requires that ultimately the popular will must prevail. It is impossible for people directly to govern themselves and, therefore, the system of representative Government is devised and our representative in-

stitutions are based upon adult suffrage. Every adult, man and woman, in India has the vote and they elect their representatives to Parliament. In our last election millions of people in India (out of total electorate of 193 million, 121 million voted in the General Elections in 1956) went to the polling booths and recorded their votes and hundreds of observers from foreign countries paid a tribute to India that the elections held were completely free. How free they were you can judge from this instance that in the small State of Kerala, the Communist Party was elected to power in the teeth of the opposition of the Congress Party which is in power and which governs the country through our Parliament in Delhi. The Congress Party could have easily prevented a Communist victory if it had "rigged" the elections, but to its credit it refused to do so.

We had to decide whether we should adopt the American or the British model of representative Government. In the British model, the Government is a part of the Legislature and is responsible to the Legislature and continues in power only so long as it has its confidence. In the United States, there is a separation of powers and the Executive is an irremovable Executive. Your President is elected by the people and he continues in office for four years irrespective of whether he has the confidence of the Congress or not. As you know, today, although the President was elected by the Republican Party, the Democratic Party is in a majority both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

In another important respect, we followed the American example and not the British. In this country and in India the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. All authorities must function under it and must be loyal to it. Under the British Constitution, Parliament is sovereign and can pass any law, the only limits to its sovereignty being those of practicability and reasonableness. An important consequence follows from the Constitution being supreme. If the Constitution is supreme, the Executive and the Legislature must be kept within constitutional bounds and must not be permitted to transgress the limits set by the Constitution. In India, as

in the United States, this function has been assigned to the Judiciary. In England, however important the Judiciary may be and however high its traditions, it must bow before the Sovereign Parliament. It has no right to consider the competence of Parliament to pass any law or to consider the constitutionality of any law. In the United States and in India, the position is entirely different. The Judiciary in America and in our country have been armed with the powerful weapon of judicial review. It can scrutinise every law passed by Parliament or the State Legislature to determine its constitutionality and, if the Legislature has exceeded its powers or overstepped its limit, the law can be declared void and inoperative.

Another important respect in which we have followed the American model is in writing into our Constitution a Bill of Rights similar to the provisions of your Constitution. Our Constitution calls them Fundamental Rights. These are rights guaranteed to all citizens and, in some cases even to those who are not citizens. These rights are to be looked upon as inalienable rights of an individual which every human being is entitled to enjoy if he is to maintain his human dignity. They deal with equality before law, prohibition against discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth, equality of opportunity in matters of public employment, right of freedom of speech and expression, right to form associations or unions, right to acquire, hold or dispose of property, right to practise any profession or to carry on any occupation, trade or business, right not to be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law, right to freedom of conscience and to freely profess and practise religion, right to one's own culture and to study in any educational institution, right to be paid compensation for compulsory acquisition of property.

In the modern complex society, conflict always arises between the rights of the individual and the security and interests of the State. When the State pursued a *laissez faire* policy, the individual was left alone to pursue his own path and to manage his own affairs, but in the modern State which

is a Welfare State and which looks after the welfare of its citizens, there is inevitably more and more encroachment upon the rights and activities of the individual. The most difficult problem of today is to draw the proper line between the conflicting claims of the State and the individual and to secure that the all-powerful State does not overstep this line. It may be said that in every case the rights of the individual must be subordinated to the social good. On the other hand, it may be equally cogently argued that the social good is determined by the State and that what the State thinks to be the social good may not necessarily be the social good envisaged by all the individuals inhabiting the State. It may also be argued that there are certain individual rights which are so fundamental and on which depends the very dignity of the human soul that no interests of the State or even the security of the State can be permitted to violate these rights.

Our Constitution has tried to solve this difficult problem in a very practical and, on the whole, satisfactory manner. The Legislature has been given the power to make laws which may contravene these fundamental rights if the contravention is in the interests of the public order, security of the State, public morality or maintenance of friendly relations with a foreign State. The Judiciary are constituted the custodians of these fundamental rights. Whether the restrictions imposed by the Legislature upon fundamental rights are reasonable restrictions or not is made a justiciable issue and by making it justiciable, the Constitution has placed in the hands of the Judiciary tremendous powers. It is not possible to deprive the citizens of any of their fundamental rights by a majority in the Legislature. The Legislature is controlled by the Judiciary and every citizen has been given the right to challenge any legislation or any act of Government or its officials which tends to deprive him of any of these rights and it is for the Judiciary to determine whether the challenge is justified or not.

It has been urged with considerable force that this power of judicial review may act as a serious impediment to important social and economic legislation which the State may desire

is a Welfare State and which looks after the welfare of its citizens, there is inevitably more and more encroachment upon the rights and activities of the individual. The most difficult problem of today is to draw the proper line between the conflicting claims of the State and the individual and to secure that the all-powerful State does not overstep this line. It may be said that in every case the rights of the individual must be subordinated to the social good. On the other hand, it may be equally cogently argued that the social good is determined by the State and that what the State thinks to be the social good may not necessarily be the social good envisaged by all the individuals inhabiting the State. It may also be argued that there are certain individual rights which are so fundamental and on which depends the very dignity of the human soul that no interests of the State or even the security of the State can be permitted to violate these rights.

Our Constitution has tried to solve this difficult problem in a very practical and, on the whole, satisfactory manner. The Legislature has been given the power to make laws which may contravene these fundamental rights if the contravention is in the interests of the public order, security of the State, public morality or maintenance of friendly relations with a foreign State. The Judiciary are constituted the custodians of these fundamental rights. Whether the restrictions imposed by the Legislature upon fundamental rights are reasonable restrictions or not is made a justiciable issue and by making it justiciable, the Constitution has placed in the hands of the Judiciary tremendous powers. It is not possible to deprive the citizens of any of their fundamental rights by a majority in the Legislature. The Legislature is controlled by the Judiciary and every citizen has been given the right to challenge any legislation or any act of Government or its officials which tends to deprive him of any of these rights and it is for the Judiciary to determine whether the challenge is justified or not.

It has been urged with considerable force that this power of judicial review may act as a serious impediment to important social and economic legislation which India may desire

to carry through in order to fight poverty, in order to do social justice, in order to raise the standards of its people and to achieve economic independence. It has been pointed out that the Courts of Law tends to be technical and may invalidate legislation on narrow theoretical grounds overlooking the larger public good and, therefore, regret has been expressed in certain quarters that our Constitution did not establish the sovereignty of Parliament and make Parliament the custodian of fundamental rights rather than the Judiciary; because it is urged that Parliament is the best judge of what legislation is necessary and to what extent legislation should trespass upon individual rights. But, our Constitution makers felt and quite rightly felt that it would be dangerous at the very inception of the new State to give uncontrolled power of legislation to the Legislature. It was realised that for a long time to come only one party would be in power with hardly any opposition and that democracy in India might have been imperilled if a single party was given the power to ride roughshod over individual rights and to ignore the protests of those who did not belong to that party. Therefore, even at the risk of slowing down the progress of the country, in the interests of freedom and democracy, an independent impartial authority was constituted to act as the arbitrator between the individual and the State and to adjudicate upon the rights and liberties of the former and the security and the interests of the latter. It is, therefore, that you find in India today that although we have launched upon a great adventure of industrialising our country and of bringing prosperity to our people, we are doing it democratically through democratic processes without regimenting our people and without sacrificing the freedom of the individual.

The people of the United States can well understand and appreciate the importance of the Judiciary and the power of judicial review given to the Judges. The Supreme Court here exercises that power and every citizen here feels that the Supreme Court is the protector of his rights and liberties and that the Congress cannot pass any law and the Government here cannot do anything which would in any way curtail those

rights of the American citizens which are safeguarded by the American Constitution. The citizen of India has the same feeling with regard to the Judges and the Courts in India. It is essential that if the Judges are to play this important role satisfactorily, they should be completely independent of the Legislature and the Executive and that its integrity and impartiality should be beyond question and should be accepted as such by the public. Therefore, under our Constitution, the Judges are irremovable and are, in no way, controlled by the Legislature or the Executive.

The American Constitution is a federal Constitution and there is a clear demarcation between the powers of the States and of the Federation. You have here what I might call a dual citizenship, citizenship of the State and citizenship of the Federation. You have also a dual Judiciary, one set of Judges enforcing State laws and the other the Federal laws. In our country it was realised that it was necessary to have a strong Central Government to avoid the danger of fissiparous tendencies among the different States. Therefore, in India, the citizen owes his allegiance only to the Union of India and although there are High Courts in different States and a Supreme Court in Delhi, the Judiciary is one and integrated. It enforces both State and Union laws or what you would call Federal laws. The Supreme Court in Delhi is the apex of the different Courts in the country and it is not only the highest federal court, it is also the highest Court of Appeal.

One difficulty which is always felt in a federation and you often felt it here is the demarcation of subjects on which the State Legislature can legislate and the Federal Legislature can legislate. The American Constitution naturally owes its characteristics to its past history. You had here independent States which decided to federate into the United States of America and, therefore, we have vestiges both in the American Constitution and in the Constitution of different States of important powers reserved to the States. In India, we have devised a rather novel machinery. There is a Union or federal list consisting of subjects in respect of which the Indian Parliament can legislate. There is a State list of sub-

jects on which the State Legislature can legislate and we have a third list which is called the Concurrent List in respect of which both the Parliament and the State Legislatures can legislate. But, what makes our Union Parliament strong is the provision that all residuary powers of legislation are with the Union Parliament. In the United States, it is the contrary and residual powers are left to the State Legislatures. The device of the Concurrent List helps the Union Legislature to bring about uniformity even in matters where the State Legislature has legislative powers. Under that list, both the State Legislature and the Union Legislature may cover the same legislative field but the legislation passed by the Union Legislature prevails over the State legislation. Here different States have different laws sometimes in important matters like criminal or divorce law, etc., and the Congress has no power to bring about uniformity.

An important feature of every federal Constitution is the bicameral legislature; the lower chamber represents the people and the upper chamber represents the constituent States. In India, we have adopted the bicameral system but not with the federal characteristics. The House of the People which corresponds to the Chamber of Representatives in the Congress is elected on the basis of adult suffrage. In the Council of States which corresponds to the Senate here, the States are not equally represented as here but according to their population.

In bringing about the Indian Union and consolidating the different parts of India into one, we had considerable difficulties after independence. As you know, under the British rule, there were many independent Indian princes who ruled their own States as dictators. If you look at a map of India in British times, you will find parts of India which were ruled by the British painted red and the States of the Princes shown yellow and there were hundreds of these yellow dots all over the map, some large and some small. After independence, we liquidated these Princes not by violence or coercion but with their consent and we repainted the map of India in one colour.

I should like to draw your attention to one aspect of our

Constitution and that is that it sets up what we call a secular State To translate it into American parlance, it means that we have a complete separation of Church and State In our country, we have no official religion In our country every man and every woman irrespective of class, community and race can look forward to any office and can enjoy the same right as anybody does We have no two classes of citizenship, a higher and a lower one We have no ghettos in our country where we shut up people and deny them the rights of citizenship India was cursed for centuries by the existence of what were known as "untouchables" or people of the lower caste who were segregated Mahatma Gandhi carried on a powerful fight against untouchability and today under our Constitution untouchability has been abolished and even made an offence and untouchables have been given the same rights as people of higher castes Only a few days back, an untouchable was appointed as Chief Minister of one of our States It is like appointing a Negro as a Governor of one of the southern States I agree that we cannot bring about social equality by law You have the same problem here Here also Negroes have equal rights under the Constitution but unfortunately social discrimination is still practised against them It takes time for people to change their attitude of mind It is only when we realise that all men are not only equal before the law but also in the eye of God that we will have both in this country and our country a completely casteless society Things have improved a great deal here and so have they in India

The Constitution of a country is only a machinery through which the country achieves its goal or what Socrates called "the good life" A Constitution may contain all the trappings of democracy, it may have a Legislature elected through adult suffrage, it may have Ministers responsible to that Legislature, it may have a strong Judiciary and even so, the Constitution may achieve nothing if it is not worked for a definite purpose and in order to achieve a specific goal The goal of our country is set out in unmistakable terms in the Preamble to the Constitution to which I have referred

But, these goals can only be achieved by laws passed by Parliament and by State Legislatures and, for that purpose, in the Constitution we have a chapter on Directive Principles which are intended as clear unmistakable guidance to the Legislatures even though they have no legal force. They contain more or less precepts and impose a moral, if not, a legal duty upon the country to apply the principles contained in this part in making laws. It is interesting to see what some of these Directive Principles contain. They lay down that the citizens have the right to adequate means of livelihood, that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good, that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment, that there is equal pay for equal work for both men and women. They also provide that the country shall, within the limits of its economic capacity and development, make effective provision for securing right to work, to education and to public assistance in cases of unemployment, old age, sickness and disablement, and in other cases of undeserved want. They also lay down that the country shall endeavour to secure, by suitable legislation or economic organisation or in any other way to all workers, agricultural, industrial or otherwise work, a living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life and full enjoyment of leisure and social and cultural opportunities. They also lay down a period of ten years from the commencement of the Constitution within which the State shall provide for free and compulsory education for all citizens until they complete the age of 14 years. These are the Directive Principles which in the last ten years we have been trying to give effect to by the laws that we have passed. This is the socialistic pattern of society towards which we are aiming. May I say one word about our socialism? There is a great deal of misunderstanding in this country as to what socialism in the context of Indian society means. Our socialism is not a doctrinaire socialism. It is a pragmatic one, but what we are trying to do is what I have just pointed out to you as em-

bodied in our Directive Principles You will find on a close study of these Directive Principles that you in this country have already successfully carried out most of them and, where you have not, you are working to give effect to them I think this country is more socialistic than India, but unfortunately people here do not realise how socialistic they are

In the last ten years, we have also brought about a social revolution again giving effect to these Directive Principles We have passed laws of marriage, divorce and inheritance under which we have given greater rights to women in India Today, the women in India occupy the same position as men There are women holding high positions in every walk of life We have women as Governors, as Ambassadors, as Judges and as Ministers

In the ultimate analysis, a Constitution must be judged by what it helps the country to achieve and applying that test, I think our Constitution has helped the country, Parliament and Government to achieve many of the goals which the people of India solemnly resolved to do when they enacted the Constitution

Justice Holmes, a very wise man, one of the wisest your country has produced, once said that like all life a Constitution was an experiment You have been experimenting with your Constitution for nearly two centuries and during that period it has helped you to create a free and prosperous society We have been experimenting with ours only for the last ten years—and we also hope, especially because our Constitution so closely and strikingly resembles yours, to achieve a free and prosperous society Our society is already free We need your help and co-operation to make it a prosperous one

COMMON BONDS

THERE IS A GREAT DEAL IN COMMON between our two countries and more and more people here and in India are realising that important fact. It would be foolish to suggest that we do not have differences. Even the best of friends have not identical characters or outlooks on life.

But what is more to the point is, as I shall be pointing out in the course of this speech, that on basic and fundamental matters which determine the structure of a country and its political philosophy we possess a striking identity.

I have been asked to explain why President Eisenhower in his recent visit to India received such a tremendous reception. That the reception was tremendous, there can be no doubt. I was an eye witness to it, having gone to India for the President's visit. I have never seen such surging crowds as I saw in New Delhi. I have never seen such sincere heartfelt enthusiasm. I have never seen any occasion when the people of a country take a visiting foreign dignitary to its heart.

The reason for this welcome to my mind was the fact that President Eisenhower appealed to a sentiment which is deeply held and cherished by people of all classes and sections in India. President Eisenhower came on a mission of peace and peace is something which is more than mere political gesture to us. It is deeply embedded in our philosophy and in our religion.

Our foreign policy is based on this sentiment and it is only if this sentiment is properly understood and appreciated that

many things in the Indian scene which may seem inexplicable become clear and understandable. One of our greatest Emperors, Ashoka, foreswore war in the midst of victory and issued his famous edict of peace. Our very national emblem is a replica of the pillar on which this edict was engraved. Buddha, one of the greatest religious leaders India has produced, preached the philosophy of gentleness and kindness and his religion has traveled far outside the frontiers of India. Millions in China and Japan and other parts of South-east Asia are today his devoted followers.

Our very political freedom was won not through blood, although there was a considerable amount of sweat and tears, but with the help of the doctrine of non violence which Mahatma Gandhi evolved and practised with such great success. Today, the Gandhian philosophy is being more and more adopted in different countries which are struggling for freedom. It is being realised that it is difficult to win freedom by resorting to violence against colonial powers which are armed with the most up to-date and destructive weapons the world has ever seen.

Even if it were possible to win freedom by violence, it could only be at a great cost of human lives and human happiness which, when freedom was ultimately achieved, would produce a result which would be tarnished by blood, violence and cruelty. An untarnished freedom, even if it took a little longer to achieve, was immeasurably better and would create traditions of freedom which would make the country strong and powerful and respected in the councils of the world.

Kipling once said that East is East and West is West and ne'er the twain shall meet. I believe that he was thinking more of India and England rather than India and the United States. Even with regard to India and England, Kipling's racial and pessimistic philosophy has proved to be wrong. England has given up her empire in India and India today is a proud and respected member of the Commonwealth. There are more contacts, cultural, commercial and others, between these two countries than there ever were before independence.

But between India and the United States there never has

been any political barrier or any feeling of superiority and inferiority or the subtle arrogance which arises as a result of one country being the ruling country and the other country being a dependent one. The people of the United States always sympathised with the aspirations of the Indian people for freedom. Indian political leaders always found a platform in this country to propagate their views. Many societies here gave moral support to the cause of Indian freedom because the United States knew what it was to be a colonial country. She herself had wrenched her freedom out of the unwilling hands of British rulers. It is true that this had been done after a bloody war, but then Gandhi had not appeared on the scene and his philosophy was unknown. We were living in times when the only known means of shaking off the colonial yoke was by taking to arms and fighting the ruling country with all the means that were at the disposal of the colonial country.

But the fact that both India and the United States were colonial countries, that they both achieved their freedom, that both had to struggle for many years before they achieved their emancipation has created a lasting bond between our peoples. We in India have always looked upon the United States as a country which not only became free herself but has always stood for freedom and has helped dependent countries to achieve freedom. We are familiar with your declaration of independence which has a resounding call to all subject countries. We are familiar with the writings and philosophy of Jefferson and we have studied with deep attention the work of Abraham Lincoln who carried the doctrine of freedom one step further—that freedom was indivisible and that it was not enough to make a country free—it was necessary that every human being living in the country should be free.

Talking of Lincoln reminds me that the one great idea which has shaken countries and societies in the modern age is privilege. Privilege is a bad and vicious thing if it is based merely on community, caste, religion or the colour of one's skin. People are more and more realising that the only privilege which is good and which will ultimately survive is

the privilege that arises from merit. We are also beginning to see that it is wrong and immoral to deny anyone his rightful place in society merely because he belongs to a particular class or a particular race.

When Lincoln put an end to slavery and emancipated the slaves here, he was thinking of both the political and moral implications of slavery. The political implications were, as he himself said, that you cannot have a country with half the people free and the other half slaves. The moral implications were those associated with the dignity of the human soul. If you believe in God and if you believe that all souls are equally precious in his eyes, then it is difficult to accept a political philosophy which looks down upon people of a particular race or of a particular colour as being subhuman or as unfit to associate with people of a different race or of a different colour.

We in India have had the same problem that you have had here. Just as you have your Negroes, we have our so-called untouchables. You abolished the slavery of the Negroes, you gave them constitutional rights, you made them citizens of this country. We have done the same. We have abolished untouchability, and under our Constitution we have given them the same fundamental rights which other citizens enjoy. We have even gone further. We have today an untouchable in our Indian Cabinet and only recently an untouchable has been appointed the Chief Minister of a State. It is like the Governor of one of your States being a Negro.

But our problem like yours has not yet been fully solved. It is one thing to bring about legal integration of the Negroes or the untouchables into the social fabric, but it is entirely different to bring about social integration. We are working hard to bring this about.

We have complete separation of the Church from the State. We call it a secular society and we are fast breaking up the strongholds of castes in our country. You are trying to do the same and we are watching you with sympathetic understanding. But the important aspect of the question is that the policy of your Government and mine is to do away with

privilege based on colour or race and not to have in our country first class and second class citizens and to confer upon every member of society the same rights and privileges.

This is unfortunately very different from what is happening in some other parts of the world where Government itself has adopted as its most important policy apartheid, which means segregation of one section of the community from the other and looking upon one section of the people as inferior. I need hardly tell you that this policy will never succeed. King Canute could not hold back the waves of the sea. No government can hold back the more majestic tide of history. The tide of history is running fast in the direction of equality and freedom. The whole continent of Africa is awake and resurgent. The unfortunate people of that continent have been kept down too long.

I think that this decade which has just started will be known in history as the decade of African freedom. It is very necessary, in my opinion, that people in this country should fully realise what is happening in the other continent. Forces of freedom are on the march. They are looking for allies and I hope and trust that they will be able to count on this country as one of their strongest allies.

Your Constitution is one of the *finest* political documents in the world. It has written into it a Bill of Rights of which you are justifiably proud. It guarantees to every citizen equality before law, freedom of person, freedom of religion and expression, and to safeguard these you have created one of the finest courts in the world, the Supreme Court, whose judges have been given the power of judicial review which means that they can declare any law to be invalid if it violates the Constitution, or set aside any order of Government if it infringes on any of the freedoms which the Constitution has guaranteed.

When we in our country sat down to draft our Constitution after we had become free in 1947, we had to consider whether we should adopt the model of the American Constitution or the British Constitution. The choice was a very important one. We were at the crossroads and we had to decide which

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

particular turn we should take, because our whole future history would be influenced by the choice that we made. In certain respects, we adopted the British model. We had a parliamentary system of Government and not your Presidential system. Our Government was part of the Legislature and was responsible to the Legislature. We did not have the irremovable executive which you have in this country.

But that is only dealing with what I might call the mechanics of politics, in a more important respect we accepted the American model. Just like you we had the Bill of Rights written into our Constitution. Our Constitution guarantees the citizens of our country their fundamental rights, the same rights, the very identical rights which your citizens enjoy. We also gave to our judges whom we made completely independent of Government the same power of judicial review which, as I have just said, your judges enjoy here. This, therefore, creates another important bond between our two countries.

Our two countries are the two greatest democracies in the world. Yours is more powerful, more wealthy and more prosperous. Ours is more populous. We have a population of 400 millions as against your 175. But both our countries do not possess merely a democratic political structure, but we are dedicated to the democratic faith, the most important article of which is that society and Government exist for the individual and in the improvement of the individual, in the maintenance of his freedom lies the most important task of the Government. Neither you nor we believe in the monolithic State, the all powerful, all embracing State which sweeps into its embrace and strangles the individual strivings, the individual aspirations, the individual originality and the individual desire to pursue his happiness in his own way.

We are, therefore, friends and comrades on the freedom field. I am sometimes amazed when people talk glibly and lightly about the free world and when they seek to exclude India from that definition because India is not in military alliance with the United States. If you equate freedom with

anti-communism, anti-communism in the military sense, then perhaps these people are right.

But I think it is wrong to equate democracy and freedom with purely negative qualities. Democracy and freedom are something positive and the free world consists of those countries which believe in democracy and freedom in a positive and even in a passionate manner. I think in that sense our two countries are the most important members of the free world. We have no treaty between us, we have no military alliance, we do not receive any military aid from you and yet to my mind our alliance and our friendship are deeper and more abiding.

The people of this country should not find it difficult to understand our political philosophy, which is based on the principle of co-existence. This is merely an extension of the Gandhian philosophy of non-violence. Live and let live is our motto. We are friendly with the Communist countries not because we believe in communism but because we feel that the only way there can be peace in this world is by reducing international tensions and international tensions can only be reduced if different countries agree to live with each other peacefully rather than exist in a perpetual ferment and all the time on the brink of war.

Our belief in peace does not go to the length of holding that we should sacrifice any part of our country to an aggressor rather than fight if necessary. We have given a recent demonstration of how this philosophy works in our relations with China. We recognised China even though it was a communist Government. We signed a declaration with her on peaceful co-existence. When China adopted aggressive tactics, we made it clear that we will fight to the last man and to the last ditch for every inch of our country. At the same time we were prepared to negotiate with that country and even now our Prime Minister is talking to the Chinese Prime Minister Chou En-lai to see if some peaceful solution can be evolved out of the present difficulties.

Gandhi always said that we must be prepared to talk and negotiate with our worst enemies, even those whom we hate

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

and despise Throughout our struggle with Great Britain, Gandhi never refused to talk to our British rulers whenever they asked him to discuss any question, and that is why we fully support your President's recent policy of what I might call the diplomatic breakthrough by which he has brought about a situation where leaders of different countries are prepared to meet and talk to each other and sit round a table and see if the situation in this weary world cannot be improved

On the economic front also we have a great deal in common You started your great career as a nation with a poor unexploited country full of great natural wealth and resources still untapped At that time you lacked the capital and you also lacked the necessary machinery To start with yours was a great agricultural country and you have now converted it into one of the greatest industrial societies the world has ever known

We are today in the position that you were about 150 years ago We have great natural resources, we have all the water and minerals and the land that we need But we need capital and machinery Although our country is largely agricultural and we have plans afoot to improve the method of cultivation and to increase the produce of the land, we realised that we cannot become a really great country unless we have a strong industrial base to our agriculture The economic greatness of a country depends upon steel, power and fuel, and upon its capacity to make machines which will produce these elements

As I said before, we have the necessary coal and iron to produce the steel, we have vast coal mines to produce the fuel we have large rivers which could give us electric power that we need Our main shortcoming is the necessary capital which is required by modern technology to put up the necessary machinery You were exactly in the same position You pushed ahead to start with, with the help of capital that Europe gave you You were a debtor and owed money all round But with the enterprise, imagination and industry of your people you have now evolved a society where industry is

most highly developed and which has helped you to become not only the most prosperous country but also a creditor country which is in a position to lend a helping hand to other countries who are struggling to achieve what you successfully achieved. Let me say that this should also be a bond between us. We are looking to you to give us a helping hand in our attempt to raise the standard of life of our people and to transform poverty into prosperity.

Do not be misled by what you hear or read about our economic policy. To a large extent that policy is similar to yours. We do not like the concentration of economic power in a few hands nor do you. You have only to look into your anti-trust laws. We do not like great disparity of wealth and we do not like unemployment, nor do you. We want the State to fulfill certain obligations towards its citizens: to see that every citizen at least gets that minimum to which he is entitled, food, education, health and shelter. Am I assuming too much when I say that you expect from your Government the same consideration? This is our so-called socialism, our socialistic approach to our economic problems. When you analyse the situation you will come to the conclusion that if we are socialists, so are you.

In the ultimate analysis, I feel that the people of the United States are and should be deeply interested in the future of Indian democracy. There are two philosophies in the world today. Both are competing with each other and sometimes they are in conflict. One philosophy preaches that a poor underdeveloped country cannot achieve economic progress without regimentation of the whole population and without the State being all powerful and without sacrificing individual liberty. The other philosophy maintains that it is possible to bring about economic advancement without sacrificing the democratic principles and the fundamental freedoms.

We believe in this latter philosophy and we are trying to give effect to it in our political and economic programme. I have no doubt the United States is vitally interested in seeing that this philosophy succeeds. The area of the free world will be considerably reduced and the ranks of freedom will

OUR TWO COUNTRIES

be considerably thinned if India were to be compelled to adopt the totalitarian philosophy.

It is, therefore, vital not only for India, not only for the United States but for the cause of freedom and democracy that our two countries should stand side by side helping each other and fighting the battle of humanity which is the same battle as the battle against poverty.
